# Exodus in 2 Chronicles 10-36:
# An Exegetical Study on Inner-Biblical Allusion

by

Daniel Allen Hutchison, Jr.




*Dissertation presented for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy*

*in the Faculty of Theology at Stellenbosch University*

Supervisor: Professor Louis C. Jonker

Faculty of Theology, Department of Old and New Testament

March 2021

## DECLARATION

By submitting this dissertation electronically, I declare that the entirety of the work contained therein is my own, original work, that I am the sole author thereof (save to the extent explicitly otherwise stated), that reproduction and publication thereof by Stellenbosch University will not infringe any third party rights and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it for obtaining any qualification.

Date: March 2021

# Abstract

A shift in scholarly studies on Chronicles has occurred in the last forty years, from primarily historical examinations to assessments of its literary features. With this shift has come a focus on how Chronicles refers to other biblical books. The primary biblical source for Chronicles is Samuel-Kings, but Chronicles refers to other biblical texts as well. However, a systematic examination of the author's allusions to a pentateuchal book has not yet been published.

This study's contribution to scholarship is a systematic evaluation of how Chronicles alludes to the book of Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36 and how those allusions impact the rhetorical arguments of that portion of the book. Additionally, this study reveals exegetical insights at specific points in 2 Chr 10-36 (including allusions not previously noted in the scholarship reviewed). The combination of three elements set this study apart from previous studies of inner-biblical allusion in the Hebrew Bible: (1) a systematic approach to finding inner-biblical allusions to one particular source, (2) a subsequent evaluation of those allusions with a robust methodology, and (3) a comparison of those allusions' rhetorical uses to a narrative analysis of the alluding text.

The study identifies sixteen inner-biblical allusions to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36 with an additional fourteen recurrences of those allusions. Chronicles uses an assortment of lexical, conceptual, and structural markers to indicate its allusions to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36, though shared language is the primary method. Each of the allusions to Exodus has one or more of the following uses: Moral Evaluation, Elevate the Temple and Priesthood, Establish and Reaffirm a Standard or Truth, Exegesis, and Encouragement.

The study also situates the allusions in their narrative context for rhetorical investigation and comparison. The study observes in Chronicles the importance of the Davidic kingship and how the people of Israel can relate to YHWH, their God, through the proper operation of the cult. The significance of the temple and its location in Jerusalem are paramount. The centrality of the temple is not in its grandeur but in its emphasis on a relationship with the God who dwells there. The kings following David succeed or fail (or both) based on how they relate to YHWH. Those who relate well to YHWH and care for his temple receive God's blessing. Those who spurn YHWH and disrupt or damage his temple receive his judgment. Chronicles uses allusions to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36 to support at least three of that section's rhetorical aims: (1) to evaluate the moral character of its characters, (2) to highlight and elevate the status of the temple and its attendants, the Levites, and (3) to establish and reaffirm the standards by which the text evaluates its characters.

# Opsomming

Die afgelope veertig jaar het ‘n verskuiwing in wetenskaplike studies van Kronieke plaasgevind, van oorwegend historiese benaderings tot die oorweging van die literêre kenmerke daarvan. Met hierdie verskuiwing word daar toenemend gefokus op hoe Kronieke na ander Bybelboeke verwys. Die primêre Bybelse bron vir Kronieke is Samuel-Konings, maar Kronieke verwys ook na ander Bybeltekste. ‘n Stelselmatige ondersoek van die skrywers se toespelings op ‘n Pentateugboek is egter nog nie gedoen nie.

Hierdie studie se bydrae tot die wetenskap is ‘n stelselmatige evaluering van hoe Kronieke in 2 Kron 10-36 na die boek Eksodus verwys, en hoe die toespelings die retoriese argumente van daardie gedeelte van die boek beïnvloed. Daarbenewens lewer hierdie studie eksegetiese insigte oor spesifieke aspekte in 2 Kronieke 10-36 op (insluitend oor verwysings wat nie voorheen in studies opgemerk is nie). Die kombinasie van drie elemente onderskei hierdie studie van vorige studies oor binne-Bybelse toespeling in die Hebreeuse Bybel: (1) ‘n Sistematiese benadering om binne-Bybelse toespelings op een spesifieke bron te vind; (2) ‘n Daaropvolgende evaluering van die toespelings met die hulp van ‘n deeglike metodologie; en (3) ‘n Vergelyking van die retoriese gebruike van daardie toespelings met ‘n narratiewe analise van die betrokke tekste.

Die studie identifiseer sestien binne-Bybelse toespelings op Eksodus in 2 Kronieke 10-36, met ‘n addisionele veertien herhalings van hierdie toespelings. Kronieke gebruik ‘n verskeidenheid leksikale, konseptuele en strukturele merkers om die toespelings op Eksodus in 2 Kronieke 10-36 aan te dui, hoewel gedeelde taal die primêre modus is. Elk van die toespelings op Eksodus word in een of meer van die volgende funksies gebruik: Morele evaluering; Aksentuering van die status van die tempel en die priesterdom; Vestigiging en bevestiging van ‘n standaard of waarheid; Eksegese; en Aanmoediging. Die studie plaas ook die toespelings in hul narratiewe kontekste met die oog op retoriese ondersoek en vergelyking. In die studie word waargeneem hoe belangrik die koningskap van Dawid in Kronieke is en hoe die volk Israel met JHWH, hul God, in verhouding staan deur die korrekte nakoming van die kultus. Die belangrikheid van die tempel en sy ligging in Jerusalem, is van die grootste belang. Die sentraliteit van die tempel is nie geleë in die grootsheid daarvan nie, maar in die klem op die verhouding met die God wat daar woon. Die konings wat Dawid volg, slaag of misluk (of albei) op grond van hoe hulle met JHWH in verhouding staan. Diegene wat wel met JHWH in verhouding staan, en na Sy tempel omsien, ontvang God se seën. Diegene wat JHWH verwerp en sy tempel ontwrig of beskadig, is onderworpe aan sy oordeel. Kronieke gebruik toespelings op Eksodus in 2 Kronieke 10-36 om ten minste drie van die retoriese doelstellings van daardie gedeelte van die narratief te ondersteun: (1) om die morele karakter van die karakters te

evalueer; (2) om die status van die tempel en sy dienaars, die Leviete, te aksentueer; en (3) om die standaarde waarvolgens die teks die karakters beoordeel, duidelik te maak en te bevestig.

# Acknowledgments

This dissertation process has been more than a few years in the making. Many people have contributed with their time, finances, and prayers to my family and me moving to South Africa. Dreams are not fulfilled in isolation. They come about through the energy and effort of those nearest and dearest to the dreamers. One beloved friend, upon his giving of a generous gift towards our move, said, “My wife and I see this as investing in the Kingdom of God.” May this process have been to its benefit. May the career this endeavor hopefully enables proclaim and advance His kingdom. I begin with thanks to our Savior for His kindness, presence, and faithful love.

Professor Ray Lubeck taught me how to study the Bible. He modeled how a student of Scripture can teach with passion and intentionality. Prof Lubeck maintained a deep and active love for the local church, his students, and his family, all the while pursuing academic rigor for the sake of his Lord. He has welcomed my family into his home and shared his experiences of pursuing further education in South Africa. Prof Lubeck even recommended to me the work of Dr. Will Kynes; little did I know that I would use Dr. Kynes’s methodology, along with Prof Lubeck’s, in this study. Ray, a million times, thank you.

Professor Jeff Arthurs taught me the power of the spoken word. He invested in me and shaped my understanding of how communication works at the corporate and personal level. He enabled me to pursue my academic interests, ultimately convincing me to bring my family across the United States to “follow” him to Gordon-Conwell. I still remember how this very tall man knelt very low to greet my 2-year-old daughter for the first time. I have learned much from him inside *and* outside the classroom. Dr. A., thank you.

Professor Louis Jonker taught me how to enter academia while keeping an outward focus. He has shown me how to excel in research and writing while loving those around him. One of his first challenges to me upon arriving was to care well for my family during my studies. That exhortation communicated so much to me about his priorities as a supervisor. Prof, you have been the epitome of what every Ph.D. student hopes for in a supervisor. You have been an encourager, a refiner, and a guide. Thank you.

Along with many employees of Stellenbosch University that have contributed to our successful move to and time in South Africa, I must highlight the staff at Multnomah University’s library, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary’s library, and Stellenbosch University’s library. They have played important roles at crucial points in the research process, and I thank them.

My family and I have some of the best friends, both back in the States and here in South Africa. The kindness and generosity of Glenwood Community Church and our friends within that congregation made this journey possible. Thank you. Erik, thank you for coming to visit. Your friendship… well, suffice it to say you mean a lot to me. To the Ruarks, thank you for helping so much in our transition here. Joel, thank you for your fervent emails that convinced us to consider moving to another continent and for introducing me to so many people here. To our Every Nation Stellenbosch church family, thank you. You have welcomed "Team America" into your fellowship and made us feel at home. To the Venters and the Morgans, you are our dearest friends. We cannot imagine our time here without you. We are so grateful.

My extended family has shown their support in manifold ways, and we appreciate their encouragement. Special thank you's are in order for Mom and Dad Hutchison, and Dan, Melissa, and Bethany, for your consistent video calls. Melissa and Bethany, thank you for coming to visit. We continue to reflect on your time here with smiles.

To my thoughtful, energetic, playful, and wonder-filled children: I thank God that He gave you to your mother and me. Lizzie, Ellie, Gracie, Sera, and Benji, I relish these opportunities to explore the world together. We are growing and learning together, and I appreciate doing so with each of you. I love each of you to the moon and back. May you continue to grow in the grace of God and remember we are in the Maker's keeping. May His face shine upon you.

Last, but most certainly not least, to my wife, Steph. I cannot encapsulate your importance to me in one paragraph, but I will try, nonetheless. You have shown and embodied grace, thoughtfulness, resourcefulness, tenacity, and deep, deep care. Your wit, humor, and adaptability bring life to our home. Your love shows its selflessness in many ways. I love how you continually surprise us with your enthusiastic ingenuity. Your love is consistent and unswerving. I am so glad you were up for this adventure. I love you. Always and Forever.

# Table of Contents

# List of Tables

# List of Abbreviations

| | |
|---|---|
| BDB | *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon* |
| *BHS* | *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* |
| ESV | English Standard Version (2016) |
| *HALOT* | *The Hebrew & Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* |
| HB/OT | Hebrew Bible / Old Testament |
| KJV | King James Version |
| LXX | Septuagint |
| NAS | New American Standard Version (1995) |
| NET | New English Translation (2006) |
| NIV | New International Version (2011) |
| NRSV | New Revised Standard Version (1989) |
| NT | New Testament |
| RSV | Revised Standard Version (1971) |
| TNK | Jewish Publication Society Tanakh (1985) |

# Chapter 1 – Introduction

When one reads Chronicles, it becomes clear that Chronicles refers to other sources in the HB/OT. Chronicles is unique among the books of the HB/OT in that so much of its material derives from other biblical books (Wallace, 1999:267). The primary biblical source for Chronicles is Samuel-Kings (Childs, 1979:645; Braun, 1986:xxiii; Noth, 1987:52; Japhet, 1997:8; Klein, 2006:30; Duke, 2009:25). There are also examples in Chronicles where there are clear connections to elsewhere in the HB/OT, but the references are not direct verbal parallels to other texts (e.g., 2 Chr 36:21 and its direct mention of the prophet Jeremiah and the verse's connection to Jer 25:11-12; 27:7; 29:10; cf. Klein, 2012:544). However, how does a reader detect connections between Chronicles and other biblical texts when the text of Chronicles is not as forthright about the connection? This study seeks to explore this question and other connected issues as they relate to one particular source for Chronicles, namely, the book of Exodus.

## 1.1 – Problem Statement and Hypothesis

This study seeks to answer the following principal questions: (1) *Where, how, and for what purpose(s) does the Chronicler reference the book of Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36?*[1] (2) *How does the Chronicler's use of Exodus impact his rhetorical argument(s) in that part of the narrative?* Japhet asserts the Chronicler "has surveyed all of Exodus to Deuteronomy as source material for his own writing; both his citations and his omissions are a function of his historiographical and theological plan" (1993:16). We hypothesize that the Chronicler's use of Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36 supports, at least in part, such a rhetorical plan for 2 Chr 10-36 and the book as a whole. The goal of this study is to discover how the Chronicler's use of Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36 fits into that plan.

We must address a preliminary issue.[2] Why will the study focus on 2 Chr 10-36? How was that unit determined? The text of Chronicles can be broken up into three major literary units: 1 Chr 1-9, 1 Chr 10-2 Chr 9, and 2 Chr 10-36. Genealogical lists make up the first unit, the stories of David (preceded by Saul's death) and Solomon the second, and the subsequent kings of Judah the third. This study will focus on the third unit (1) as a practical matter of limiting the scope of the study to a feasible length and (2) because of our own interest in the Chronicler's view of the kings after Solomon.

---

[1] We discuss our understanding of the identity of the "Chronicler" below in 1.3.1.

[2] Further underlying questions related to methodology will be addressed below in Chapter 2. Such questions are: How do we identify references to Exodus and the nature of those references? How do we identify the author's purpose in making those references? How do we identify the Chronicler's rhetorical argument, both overall and in our specified text?

## 1.2 – Presuppositions

We cannot know the identity of the Chronicler himself (see 1.3.1 below), but we do have both the text of Chronicles and an awareness of its approximate date of composition and historical setting (see 1.3.3.1 below). A close and careful reading of the narrative text itself with all its literary devices and structural delineations allows for understanding the rhetorical intentions of its author (see Chapter 2 below, especially 2.2.4.1 and 2.2.4.2).[3] Kalimi compares the Chronicler and the Deuteronomistic historian and adduces: "Each author, therefore, reflects his own time, place and political situation. Thus, what they account about the past, how they represent the 'history,' reflects their perspective on the present" (2005a:157).

The book of Chronicles never explicitly quotes the book of Exodus. The events of Israel's exodus from Egypt and their time in the wilderness are absent from Chronicles. However, there are many references to the book of Exodus made by the Chronicler in his work. Many argue that there should be at least some verbal correspondence between two texts to establish an allusion (see 2.3.1 below). There are various methods for establishing these connections through the close comparison of texts. Speaking of the Chronicler's use of biblical sources in general, Japhet posits, "A careful study of the Chronicler's work would fully uncover his intricate attitude to these sources, displaying an interesting combination of servitude and freedom…" (1993:15).[4] We are concerned with the texts' final forms for literary comparison. Schultz explains: "To analyze quotation synchronically involves interpreting it within the context of the entire book or books in which it is located. This places the interpreter's focus on the final canonical form of the book rather than on antecedent oral or written stages or posited historical influences" (1999:233; cf. Lester, 2015:13-14).

## 1.3 – Background

Chronicles has increasingly been the subject of academic study in the last few decades (Kleinig, 1994:43; Levin, 2003:229; Jonker, 2014:125). This overview summarizes the trends in this resurgence as they relate to the study at hand. An overarching trend has been to move away from investigating the historicity of Chronicles and instead to focus on literary analysis to evaluate

---

[3] Lyons (2009:67-75) provides helpful criteria to bring some objectivity to the endeavor. Cf. Kynes: "If, however, the repetition of elements from an earlier text seems to serve a 'rhetorical or strategic end,' as Sommer says, authorial intention is likely. Thus, like quantitative observations, rhetorical ones may help identify allusions, but they do not define them. If this argument is built not from assumptions about the author's psychology based on criteria external to the text, but from the text itself, it avoids running aground on the intentional fallacy" (2012:32-33). See again 2.2.4.1 and 2.2.4.2 below.

[4] Likewise, Kleinig suggests, "The study of the employment by the Chronicler of both biblical and extrabiblical sources has begun to disclose the character of Chronicles as a piece of literature with its own integrity and unique conventions of composition. Further study may give us access to the mind of the author as an exegete and theologian and reveal the social world of his audience with its interest in tradition and delineations of authority" (1994:49).

the arguments of the book (Kleinig, 1994:43). This shift to literary emphasis impacts multiple areas of study. Questions of Chronicles' unity, authorship, placement within the HB/OT canon, and its date of writing have shifted from those of historical veracity to those of literary function. An increased interest in the literary nature of Chronicles has also seen increased discussion of the book's genre and its thematic emphases. As one might expect, such increases have also given rise to studies of the literary devices present in Chronicles and their rhetorical and interpretative impact. One such literary device receiving particular attention has been the Chronicler's use of other sources.

### 1.3.1 – Unity and Authorship

The unity (or disunity) of 1-2 Chronicles impacts the coherence of an overall purpose in its writing. Kleinig declares in his summary of research on Chronicles, "While there is now general agreement on the extent of Chronicles [that it is a separate work from Ezra-Nehemiah], no consensus has yet been reached on its unity" (1994:44). Duke's summative article echoes this fifteen years later (2009:14). Yet, Kleinig states later in his discussion of dating, "most scholars hold to the unity of Chronicles" (1994:46). Both Kleinig and Duke note the rise of literary interest as a recognizable explanation of why scholars are moving towards affirming the unity of Chronicles.

Chronicles does not name its author, though tradition identifies the author as Ezra (Japhet, 1993:23-24). With no certain identification, most scholars are content to label the author(s) and/or editor(s) of 1-2 Chronicles as the "Chronicler" or "Chr." (Siedlecki, 1999:229 n. 1; Jonker, 2013a:7). The common practice is to refer to the Chronicler with masculine pronouns while recognizing this is ultimately arbitrary (Duke, 1999:100 n. 3). This study continues this practice.

### 1.3.2 – Location in HB/OT Canon

The location of Chronicles in the HB/OT canon depends on which version of the HB/OT one reads. In most modern English translations, 1-2 Chronicles appear as the thirteenth and fourteenth books, following 1-2 Kings. However, Chronicles appears in the Writings in ancient Hebrew versions as the initial book of the Writings, the penultimate book, or the final book. Goswell summarizes the various positions in which ancient versions place Chronicles and reviews the resulting rhetorical implications (2017). Goswell sees value in each position and does not prefer one over the other. "Each position has its rationale and potentially contributes to the understanding of readers. There are no grounds for insisting that any one position is the earliest or best" (298; cf.

2020:458-459, 469).[5] We recognize that the canonical order of the HB/OT is a vast and complicated topic far outside the scope of this study. For the sake of the present study, any references to canonical order will refer to the order of the HB/OT books as published in *BHS*.[6] This ordering places Chronicles as the final book of the HB/OT.

### 1.3.3 – Date of Writing

The date of writing for both Chronicles and Exodus is relevant to our interests since the diachronic relationship between the books provides an understanding of what biblical sources were available at the time of writing of each. Also, dating a biblical book yields "significant interpretive gains… because of insistence that biblical texts be firmly located in their socio-political contexts and compositional milieu" (Bodner, 2015:1).

#### 1.3.3.1 – The Date of the Book of Chronicles

Regarding the date of writing for Chronicles, there are differing opinions certainly (e.g., Schniedewind, 1999:158-159; Kleinig, 1994:46-47; see the list of scholars in Koorevaar, 2015:215), but most scholars date Chronicles in the fourth century BCE (Janzen, 2018:10), with some specifying further the mid-to-late fourth century BCE (Jonker, 2008b:654, 667; Duke, 2009:16-22). Such a dating arises from the Chronicler's mention of post-exilic people and events (1 Chr 3; 9; 2 Chr 36), the presence of Persian loan words in the text, and the time needed for the late sixth-century prophet Zechariah to develop the requisite authority to be sourced by the Chronicler (Janzen, 2018:10-11; cf. Klein, 2006:14-15). Klein adds that the relationship between Tadmor and Hamath-zobah in 2 Chr 8:3–4 could also indicate a Persian administrative practice (2006:15). Koorevaar sees the connections in Chronicles to the book of Nehemiah as indicative of a date near the end of the fifth century BCE. Nevertheless, he grants that a possible end date for the writing of Chronicles could extend into the fourth century based on the post-exilic genealogies in 1 Chr 3 and the inherent variability in how many years one counts in the length of a generation (2015:215-218). Kalimi also sees this as a possibility (2004:368) and understands the date of writing in the "end of the fifth to the first quarter of the fourth century B.C.E." (2009:190). Even though Chronicles appears to lack any overt lexical or historical Greek references (Kalimi, 2004:353-357, 370; Janzen, 2018:12), Jonker shows that the presence of subtle Greek influences (e.g., emphasizing the importance of peace in a kingdom) would not negate a date in the Persian period (2008b).

---

[5] Not all scholars agree with such a statement. See, e.g., Koorevaar (2015) and Shields (2019) who both argue for the placement of Chronicles at the end of the HB/OT canon.

[6] Regarding the placement of Chronicles at the end of the canon in *BHS*, see Koorevaar (2015:213-214).

### 1.3.3.2 – The Date of the Book of Exodus

We then must consider the date of writing for the book of Exodus. Was it available (in some form) to the Chronicler, or was it being written concurrently with Chronicles (or after Chronicles), and thus we need to entertain the possibility that Exodus is referring to Chronicles when we observe connections between the books? The direction of dependence or influence impacts exegesis. The dating of Exodus (and the Pentateuch in general) is not so quickly summarized as is Chronicles, so we discuss it in somewhat more detail. The range of proposed dates for the writing of Exodus is vast, ranging from the traditional understanding of Mosaic authorship (with presumed subsequent editing) to the fourth century BCE. We concern ourselves here with those arguments that date the writing of Exodus primarily later (post-exilic) since arguments for an earlier date (pre-exilic or exilic) would indicate no possible date overlap with the writing of Chronicles.[7]

As evidenced by the dating of Chronicles above, scholars use many types of arguments to date biblical texts. Römer summarizes several approaches that impact how scholars date the Pentateuch (2016:361-370): Linguistic Evidence,[8] Allegorical Dating, Argument from Silence, *Terminus a Quo* and *Terminus ad Quem*,[9] Dating by External Comparison, and Relative Dating by Internal Comparison.[10] Römer finds the first few approaches to be weak, and the latter few stronger (363). Each approach can contribute to an argument for a specific date, date range, or relative dating, but none of them confirms dating in and of themselves (cf. 364; Schmid, 2015:341).

A later dating of the Pentateuch typically comes from scholars whose views have built upon or at least had their foundations in the Documentary Hypothesis (though the scholars may have

---

[7] For examples of arguments for an earlier dating of the writing of Exodus, see Stuart (2006:26-34) and Merrill (2014:4-7). For a summation of the Documentary Hypothesis (or "Source Theory"), which dates the writing and subsequent redactions of the Pentateuch in the ninth to fifth centuries BCE, see Albertz (2018:65-66). Garrett does not espouse any one particular dating (or range) for the Pentateuch's writing but rejects the documentary hypothesis and prescribes instead finding newer solutions for dating the Pentateuch and thus Exodus (2014:15-20). As one example, Garrett highlights the work of David Wright who connects the Covenant Code of Exod 21-24 to the Code of Hammurabi and places the Covenant Code around 740-640 BCE (19-20).

[8] Römer doubts the efficacy of linguistic evidence, especially as it relates to dating a text based on a text's use of Late Biblical Hebrew versus Classical Biblical Hebrew. Römer raises multiple methodological concerns about such a practice and appears to give little credence to the approach (2016:361-363), while Schmid voices his hesitancy with linguistic dating and suggests it can only be used with other arguments (2015:340-341). Schmid also acknowledges that the debate on the value of linguistic evidence for dating texts is only beginning (340). Römer, Schmid, and others who advocate for a later dating of the Pentateuch perhaps have vested interests in downplaying the efficacy of linguistic dating, as such linguistic evidence appears to argue against their dating. Studies such as the one by Petersson (2019) may begin to address methodological concerns noted by Römer and Schmid.

[9] Römer provides examples of *Terminus a Quo* and *Terminus ad Quem* and how they can be applied to the Pentateuch. His argumentation regarding the LXX Torah places a Hebrew pentateuchal *terminus ad quem* "at least at the end of the fourth century" (2016:357-358; cf. 367).

[10] Pakkala presents various options for the content of Ezra's Torah and states that "the traditional and most widespread view" sees Ezra's Torah as "final or almost final". This then has the Pentateuch "completed by the end of the fifth century BCE" (2004:284-286, here 285-286).

ultimately rejected specific tenets of the Documentary Hypothesis).[11] The Documentary Hypothesis does not have as many advocates today as has been the case in the past (Albertz, 2018:82), but it is not without proponents entirely.[12] Schmid observes a divide in scholarship between "documentarians" and "supplementarians" (2015:332).[13] "The difference between the two positions involves *how many and which kinds* of documents are assumed and how the process of their compilation and redactional expansion is best reconstructed" (332, emphasis original). Albertz also differentiates between those advocating Source Theory and Supplement Theories and clarifies the "which kinds" dimension we observe in Schmid (2018:73). Albertz labels the two competing concepts of this dimension as the "highway model" and the "island-bridge model". The "highway model" sees redactional layers of the Pentateuch as more or less complete documents that get intermingled and reworked (73). In an "island-bridge model", "several smaller and larger compositions… emerged independently from each other in different times until they were interconnected and thus increased to larger and larger entities" (73). Since supplementarians generally date the Pentateuch later, we focus on that position.

There is variety within the supplementarian position on dating the writing of the book of Exodus (Schmid, 2015:337). However, there is still an underlying agreement among those who hold to the position on the number of sources for Exodus, namely two: a priestly source (P) and a non-priestly (Non-P) source. After Albertz evaluates four newer models for the Pentateuch's development (2018:74-82), he highlights his "island-bridge" view (which is shared by most in his discussion) that "the patriarchal story and the exodus story originally constituted two separated foundation histories, which went through their own literary history for a long time, until they were literally connected" (83). Albertz cites studies by Schmid and Gertz to assert this connection came about through the P source (84).

How then might a supplementarian date these two sources for Exodus? For the Non-P source, Albertz's latest model puts small portions of the exodus narrative originating in pre-exilic time (2018:84-85, 92) and a large expansion of Non-P Exodus as a "late exilic… composition" (85, 92).[14] For the P source, Römer sees "that a Persian period dating is the best option" (2016:370).

---

[11] See Schmid (2015:331-332) for a summary of four points on which Schmid says many current pentateuchal scholars agree. These four points seem to align with the ideology undergirding the Documentary Hypothesis. As one example for the dating of Exodus, Dozeman acknowledges his connection to the Documentary Hypothesis and its impact on his commentary but also "depart[s] from the Documentary Hypothesis" (2009:35). Dozeman sees two main sources for Exodus (he calls them "P-History" and "Non-P History") but limits his dating specificity to: "Both histories were composed in the exile or later, although each contains literature from earlier periods in Israel's history" (2009:48).

[12] For a list, see Albertz (2018:66 n. 5, 67 n. 10).

[13] For examples of "supplementarians", see Albertz (2018:67 n. 9).

[14] Albertz previously had been more specific: "the period from about 540 to 520 B.C.E. is the most probable" (2011:66-67, here 67; cf. 2015:3).

Schmid suggests "in the early Persian period" (2015:331) and, more specifically, "slightly before 525 B.C.E." (2014:35), "the date of the Persian conquest of Egypt by Cambyses" (2015:338). Albertz puts a priestly editor's combination of Genesis and Exodus in "the early post-exilic time" (2018:85). Albertz suggests further redactions occur throughout the fifth century BCE with "the final redaction" (of the whole Pentateuch, not just Exodus) coming in connection with Ezra's mission in 398 BCE (2018:86, 92).[15] Such dating makes the (proto-) Pentateuch and certainly (proto-) Exodus available to the Chronicler.

### 1.3.4 – Genre

There is no consensus on the genre of the book of Chronicles. Determining the genre of a text is a crucial early step in determining a text's meaning. "[T]he prior recognition of genre leads the audience to the correct expectations about authorial intent and how one should go about further interpretation. Still, regarding this primary step, scholars have not come up with a genre classification for Chronicles over which there is general agreement" (Duke, 2009:30; cf. Hagan, 2019:199). Most scholars point to a type of history as the best way to classify Chronicles, though these genre assignments often come with qualifying labels and caveats.[16] While no specific term may be agreed upon anytime soon, there are certainly theological emphases in the Chronicler's narrative. "That the Chronicler had strong historical and theological motives in writing his work is self-evident; why else would he bother to rewrite the history of a period which was already documented?" (Japhet, 1993:43).[17] Since Chronicles is a narrative text, we can examine it using the tools of literary analysis to help determine its meaning.

### 1.3.5 – Themes

Most scholars recognize two critical topics in Chronicles, the Davidic line and the Jerusalem temple. From there, thematic assessments begin to diverge, covering a wide range of topics. If the

---

[15] Albertz had previously suggested final minor pentateuchal redactions (including some in Exodus) had occurred even later (2015:7-8), but his 2018 article seems to have moved away from that position.

[16] See Noth (1987:29-30); De Vries (1989:15-16); Japhet (1993:32); and Jonker (2007a; 2013a:14-16). While he does not specifically discuss a genre for the work, Knoppers works through issues related to an understanding of Chronicles as "Rewritten Bible" (2004a:129-134). He concludes: "Given its unique literary structure and its unparalleled content, Chronicles is more than a paraphrase or literary elaboration of the primary history. Chronicles needs to be understood as its own work" (134).

[17] See also Klein (2006:17-19) who "would prefer to call Chronicles a work of historiography and of theology" (19). McKenzie labels Chronicles "a theological rewriting of Bible history for instructional purposes" (2004:34). Hicks says the Chronicler "writes a theological history… While he is a historian in that he makes factual claims about the past, he is a theologian who uses history to proclaim a message. He is a narrative theologian" (2001:26). Kalimi concludes "The literary nature of Chronicles is historiography… Chr also attempted to express his theology and 'philosophy' of history through his composition and so created a literary work that fits well within late biblical historiography" (1997:89). Slotki writes that "The dominant feature of *Chronicles* is a presentation of the historical events from a religious angle" (1994:xi).

Chronicler's work is primarily theological, then the emphasized themes turn toward religious practices, the role of the Levitical priests, and the relationship between the people of Israel and their God. If the Chronicler is more concerned with the historical, then thematic interpretations move towards the identity and lineage of his people and the role and responsibility of the kings in leading them. Johnstone sees the Chronicler's primary concern as the relationship between Israel and their God (1997a:10). Braun states that the Chronicler's interest "above all" is the legitimacy of the Jerusalem temple, but then goes on to name seven "theological themes" in Chronicles ranging from the religious to the historical, from the national to the personal (1986: xxviii-xli). Scholars who see a more blended approach by the Chronicler in terms of theology and history then wrestle with balancing these thematic emphases and whether he had one singular focus in writing Chronicles. We concur with Japhet, who concludes:

> It is doubtful, however, whether one single and unilateral purpose would account for such an enormous enterprise, with all its complexities of content and form. Chronicles is not a manifesto devoted to a specific political movement but a more general and comprehensive theological stock-taking, striving to achieve a new religious balance in the face of a changing world. For the Chronicler, 'the history of Israel' is the arena in which God's providence and rule of his people are enacted. By unveiling the principles which govern its history, a firm foundation is laid for the future existence of Israel. It is from this 'total' perspective that the grand historical and theological enterprise should be judged (1993:43-44).

We examine prominent themes in Chronicles in Chapter 5 (see especially 5.6).

### 1.3.6 – Literary Devices

As noted above, a shift in scholarly studies has occurred from primarily historical examinations of Chronicles to assessments of its literary features. Kleinig (1994:49-51) notes the value of analyzing Chronicles from a literary perspective for discovering both interpretative meaning and structural development but says, "even though many scholars have made incidental observations on the literary features of Chronicles, no one has, as yet, drawn them together in a comprehensive way" (49). Kalimi seems to have answered that call with his work (2005b). Duke summarizes Kalimi's work and recognizes its importance (2009:34-35). Duke concedes that Kalimi's underlying assumptions have some weaknesses but ultimately resolves, "Kalimi's massive work should become the starting point for ever more precise and fruitful discussions of biblical literary techniques and historiography" (35). Authors increasingly note the importance and resulting rhetorical effects of the Chronicler's literary devices. Bodner dedicates three chapters of his work to

analyzing how the Chronicler uses literary devices in three distinct passages to support the messages of Chronicles (2015).

### 1.3.7 – Use of Other Sources

One such literary device gaining more attention has been the Chronicler's use of other sources. This attention aligns with the increasing tide of scholars studying the HB/OT's use of other HB/OT texts. While the endeavor yields rich interpretative fruit, it does not come without difficulty. After quoting Emanuel Tov on the inherent difficulties in the field of textual criticism, Leonard writes, "Similarly in the search for textual allusions, certain principles circumscribe the process. These principles must be applied carefully, however, and with a recognition of their limitations" (2008:265). With such a task, specific issues need to be addressed: (1) What is a proper designation for the use of a biblical text by another? (2) How does a reader identify a biblical text's use of another source? (3) Turning to the Chronicler's use of other sources, what biblical texts does the Chronicler use? (4) To what extent have the Chronicler's use of other texts been examined by scholars? We address the first two issues in 2.2 below. We address the latter two presently.

The Chronicler used other sources in the creation of his work. Japhet notes this is "confirmed even by a superficial reading of the book" (1993:14). The Chronicler used biblical and extra-biblical sources, but this study's primary concern is his use of biblical sources, namely, Exodus.[18] Given that Chronicles covers so much of Israel's history, it is ironic that "[t]he intermediate history of Israel, told in Exodus through 1 Samuel, is not found in Chronicles… some of the most important events in the history of Israel, such as the descent into Egypt, the exodus, the revelation at Mount Sinai, the conquest of the land of Canaan, the settlement, and the periods of Joshua, the judges, and Saul are not described" (Japhet, 1979:206). Despite this absence, many have observed that the Chronicler used, along with Samuel and Kings, the Pentateuch, Joshua, various prophetical books, Psalms, Ezra-Nehemiah, and perhaps Lamentations (Japhet, 1993:14-19; Johnstone, 1998:90-140; Wallace, 1999; Hicks, 2001:22-23; Knoppers, 2004a:68; 2012; McKenzie, 2004:35-36; Klein, 2006:32-39; Jonker, 2008a; 2013a:12).[19] The Chronicler indicates his use of other texts in multiple

---

[18] See Knoppers (2004a:118-128) for a review of the issues related to the Chronicler's use of extra-biblical sources.

[19] Contra Braun who asserts: "Concerning other source materials [besides Samuel-Kings] utilized by the author, we are in the dark. Most likely, this author, or a later one, did have before him certain materials, of which genealogical lists, especially those related to the priests and Levites, are most prominent. A second type of material may have sprung up military/census type lists, such as we find incorporated in 1 Chr 11-12. Apart from this, it is probably fanciful to ascribe knowledge of additional sources to the writer" (1986:xxiii). Braun does not provide a rationale for his statements on the Chronicler's sources. Auld maintains that a relationship between Chronicles and Samuel and Kings is possible, but not likely (2000). He suggests a common, shared source rather than a direct connection between the books. Much of the focus of Auld's argument lies in the uses of various titles and names, but his argument does not move from

ways, from formulaic quotations to subtle lexical borrowing (Japhet, 1993:14-23; Kalimi, 2005b:194-214). With this understanding, scholars also note the difficulty determining what form or version the Chronicler's sources were in when he referenced them. This difficulty should be considered when comparing other biblical texts with Chronicles (Jonker, 2013a:11-12).

As noted above, scholars affirm pentateuchal connections in Chronicles. Commentators frequently mention the Chronicler's use of Genesis in assembling his opening genealogy in 1 Chr 1-9.[20] Scholars have affirmed how the Chronicler's use of Exodus shows his rhetorical skill with pentateuchal sources.[21] The Chronicler's use of Leviticus and Numbers has garnered some attention.[22] Deuteronomy plays a role in the Chronicler's text as well.[23]

However, most notations of the Chronicler's use of the Pentateuch come in an *ad hoc* manner.[24] These notations have not lacked insight or helpfulness, quite the opposite. Scholars have only just begun to work systematically through Chronicles with focused attention on the Chronicler's use of the Pentateuch or a specific pentateuchal book. It appears only one scholar has identified pentateuchal allusions and then argued for the purpose the Chronicler had in referencing the Pentateuch or one of its books multiple times. Spawn tracks the use of citation formulae (which he terms "exegetical devices") through the Solomon and Hezekiah narratives in 2 Chronicles (2012). Spawn concludes:

> In Chronicles, the further the combined reigns of David and Solomon recede into the past (1 Chr 10-2 Chr 9), and the nearer the narrative gets to exile (2 Chr 36), the more the Chr introduces exegetical devices into his history to model the citation and interpretation of

---

theory to proof. A shared, common source certainly is a possibility, but his examples do not require a shared source. Ultimately, his argument is more complex than the traditional understanding that Chronicles uses Samuel and Kings as sources and so is less likely than a direct connection. Regarding Lamentations, its inclusion in this list is predicated on the Chronicler referring to the HB/OT book now understood as Lamentations when he mentions "the Laments" (הַקִּינוֹת) in 2 Chr 35:25; not all agree. See Klein (2012:528).

[20] E.g., Japhet writes, "As illustrated by his introductory chapter (I Chron. 1.1-2.2), the book of Genesis has been scanned systematically… Chapter 1 is thus the Chronicler's own way of presenting all of Genesis" (1993:15). Cf. Klein (2006:56-59).

[21] E.g., Johnstone shows how Exod 30 shapes the Chronicler's understanding of the Davidic census in 1 Chr 21 (1998:128-140); Jonker brings to light the parallels between characters from Exodus and 2 Chronicles and "the Chronicler's deliberate literary aim to embed Solomon's reign in some other significant contexts" (2013a:169-170, here 170); Nihan demonstrates how the Chronicler's familiarity with, and use of, the pentateuchal material, specifically Exodus, has informed his argument that Solomon's temple "is represented in Chronicles as the legitimate heir and successor of the wilderness sanctuary" (2016:267-275, here 269); Japhet discusses how the Chronicler's use of Exod 14 in 2 Chr 20 "highlight[s] the Chronicler's view of this battle as a pure miracle" (1993:795).

[22] See, e.g., Johnstone (1998:115-127); Jonker (2013a:69-72; 2017); Levine (2018).

[23] See, e.g., Nihan (2016:260-267).

[24] Cf. Kynes (2012:16). After discussing scholarship's study of Job's use of the Psalms, Kynes notes that "most of this work has been *ad hoc*, neither built on nor leading to a coherent formulation of the use of the Psalms in Job, nor drawing wider conclusions about the impact of these allusions on the interpretation of Job."

> the 'Golden' Era. Even though the pentateuchal traditions are not his chief interest, the Chr has successfully punctuated strategic narratives in Chronicles with exegetical devices to develop the observance and handling of the Law in his community (328).

Spawn limits his investigation to the use of citation formulae, and that in only two narrative sections of 2 Chronicles. He states in his introduction that his "essay… serves as a basis for the future examination of the hermeneutical tools employed in the Josianic account" (327). That future writing has not yet been published.

## 1.4 – Study Structure

With the study's aims, presuppositions, and background established, we now turn to how it will develop. Chapter 2 will first examine the relevant technical terms for the study, survey the development of HB/OT allusion studies in the past few decades, and argue for using the term "inner-biblical allusion" in our study rather than "intertextuality". Chapter 2 then presents the operating methodology for the remainder of the study, both the repeated process for studying the inner-biblical allusions to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36 and analyzing the narrative of Chronicles. This study does not develop a new methodology but instead adopts and adapts methodologies from others.

Chapters 3-5 will be the heart of the study. Chapters 3-4 will address the first principal question above in 1.1. Chapter 3 will summarize the process used to discover the allusions and discuss examples of false positives. The chapter will then proceed through the methodological steps outlined in Chapter 2 for each identified allusive passage in 2 Chr 10-36 to the book of Exodus, assess the nature of those allusions, and analyze the rhetorical argument(s) motivating the allusions. Chapter 4 will examine the resultant themes present in the allusions studied in Chapter 3 and evaluate if a dominant purpose (or purposes) for the Chronicler's use of Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36 emerges. Chapter 5 will address the second principal question above in 1.1. Chapter 5 will investigate the text of 1-2 Chronicles according to the narrative analysis methodology presented in Chapter 2 to determine the overall rhetorical argument(s) and theme(s) present in Chronicles, especially 2 Chr 10-36. Chapter 5 will then compare those findings to the findings in Chapter 4, namely, how the Chronicler's use(s) of allusions to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36 fit into his overall argument(s) for that narrative unit.

Chapter 6 will conclude the study by summarizing its findings, discussing the study's potential impact on the field, and offering areas for further study.

# Chapter 2 – Methodology

## 2.1 – Introduction

This study seeks to answer the following principal questions: Where, how, and for what purpose(s) does the Chronicler reference the book of Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36? How does the Chronicler's use of Exodus impact his rhetorical argument(s) in that part of the narrative? We must resolve underlying issues to answer these principal questions. How do we identify (1) references in 2 Chr 10-36 to Exodus and the nature of those references, (2) the author's purpose in making those references, and (3) the Chronicler's rhetorical argument(s) in our specified text? This chapter addresses these underlying questions, while Chapters 3-5 will address the principal questions. The goal of this chapter is to establish and define certain terminology used in this study, the process to be repeated with each encountered literary reference to the book of Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36, and the method used for analyzing narrative and its argument(s).

We must pause before addressing these underlying and principal questions to acknowledge an inherent difficulty in such a study. Answering these questions is ultimately a subjective act. This type of literary evaluation cannot be proven as one determines the measurements of a piece of paper. Rather, analysis of verbal connections between texts "is an art, not a science" (Sommer, 1998:35).[1] Lester, in his study of literary connections between the biblical books of Daniel and Isaiah, asserts, "Allusion, like other rhetorical tropes, can never be established as a matter of proof but is a matter of subjective assessment and advocacy" (2015:111; cf. Kynes, 2020:626). In his essay on finding biblical dependence on extra-biblical materials, Carr concludes, "In the end, no list of criteria, no methodological process will solve the problem of determining literary dependence without using *judgment* on how to apply and weigh a given set of criteria" (2017:52, emphasis original). The same is true of examining literary connections within the Bible. It is a decidedly human endeavor.[2]

We acknowledge this subjectivity, but it does not mean we end our research or cannot introduce processes to guide our understanding and mitigate some of the subjectivity. Schultz proposes that instead of abandoning studies of literary connections, "it is preferable to suggest some corrective measures and alternative approaches which may serve to curb the promiscuous

---

[1] See also Brettler (2017:77 n. 15) who likewise cites Sommer. Cf. Sommer (1996b:486), Leonard (2008:264), and 1.3.7 above.

[2] Mathematical models and automation may help in the future, but that point has not yet been reached. See again Brettler (2017:77 n. 15) for a discussion of two recent biblical studies that employed mathematical models. See Manjavacas *et al*. (2019) regarding automated allusion detection.

attribution and evaluation of quotation and redirect some of the scholarly energy devoted to the problem in a more fruitful direction" (1999:60). The methodological process outlined in this chapter attempts to provide such measures to resolve the underlying issues noted above and provide criteria by which we determine and evaluate literary connections between this study's two corpora. Even in the few citations of other studies thus far in this chapter, one may note different terms used when discussing literary connections ('allusion', 'literary dependence', and 'quotation'). The following section addresses terminology, how this study labels the literary connections it examines, and why those labels are chosen.

## 2.2 – Terminology

Clear definitions are helpful in any academic undertaking, but the study of one biblical text using another has particular terminological issues that require explanation. Multiple terms have been applied to the study of inner-biblical literary connections.[3] Depending on the study, these terms may be clearly defined and differentiated, or they may be used in such a way that they overlap and share semantic meaning and yield little difference in understanding. In the case of the latter, confusion may ensue. Zevit summarizes the terminology issue in his opening essay for the volume *Subtle Citation, Allusion, and Translation in the Hebrew Bible*: "The reason for this semantic blurriness in biblical studies is that the terms and their definitions are borrowed eclectically by biblicists from scholars specializing in general or comparative literature. Both of these are large, prestigious fields in the humanities, but they themselves are rent by competing sets of terminology and beset by terminological vagueness" (2017:12-13). Gibson, in his study of inner-biblical allusion in Malachi, likewise acknowledges the terminological confusion present in the field and terms often used. His is a positive example of a study that explains the terms used and clarifies why other terms were avoided (2016:30-32, 41-43). Schultz's book is an enlightening study on verbal parallels in the HB/OT but is an example that confuses the terminological issue (1999). In reference to textual connections, Schultz uses the term 'quotation' throughout his study in the same way others have used 'inner-biblical exegesis' (Fishbane, 1985; Awabdy, 2012), 'allusion' (Sommer, 1998; Leonard, 2008; Lester, 2015), or some variation of 'intertextuality' (Stead, 2009; Kynes, 2012; Lee, 2015).[4]

---

[3] Such as intertextuality, inner-biblical exegesis, allusion, influence, verbal parallel, quotation, echo, and trace.

[4] Schultz supports his preference for 'quotation' by citing its widespread use prior to his writing (1999:217), but the scholars Schultz cites for supporting his term selection published between 1891 and 1982, all before Fishbane's landmark 1985 contribution, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel.* The field has not followed Schultz's use of 'quotation' in the twenty years since his writing but tends to follow von Rad (whose opinion Schultz mentions [218]) and others who speak of quotation only when an introductory formula or similar is used in a biblical text. Cf. von Rad

No consensus has been reached; multiple terms have been used regularly in publications of the last forty years. Agreement and clarity in the field are desired and would be helpful. This study joins with others who have highlighted the importance of terminological clarity and called for specificity (Sommer, 1996b; 1998; Moyise, 2002: Miller, 2011; Carr, 2012; Lester, 2013; 2015; Meek, 2014; Zevit, 2017).

The remainder of this section discusses a well-known term in this field, briefly reviews the study of inner-biblical connections in the last forty years, and explains the main terms utilized throughout the remainder of the study.

### 2.2.1 – Intertextuality

Perhaps the most well-known term from the last three decades of studies of inner-biblical literary connections is 'intertextuality'. Julia Kristeva introduced the term into the field of literary criticism in the 1960s.[5] The term saw its first published uses in biblical studies in 1989.[6] Tull provides an excellent introduction to the term:

> The concept of 'intertextuality', as the name implies, concerns interrelationships among texts. Thus far do theorists and practitioners concur, both in the area of biblical studies and in the wider world of literary theory. From this point on, however, the concept of intertextuality represents a battleground of differing emphases and claims, both linguistic and ideological. The most widely made second statement concerning intertextuality is that few agree on how best to understand and use the term… (2000:59; cf. Grohmann & Kim, 2019:12).

It is outside the scope of this study to provide an extensive examination of the term 'intertextuality', its history, and its influence upon various fields of academia.[7] We briefly concentrate here on the term's general concepts relevant to this discussion of terminology and why this study does not use the term to describe its examination of related biblical texts.

Kristeva adapts the ideas of Russian semiotician Mikhail Bakhtin when she introduces Bakhtin and 'intertextuality' to the Western world. She begins with Bakhtin's idea that all words are

---

(1966:279). Van Grol also confuses terminology by distinguishing two types of exegesis (interpretation and application), claims his text of Ezra 9:6-9 is the latter, then uses 'allusion' and 'allude' throughout the remainder of his essay to describe how Ezra 9 interacts with other biblical texts (1998).

[5] Kristeva's first two essays with the term were dated 1966 and 1966-67 but appear to have not garnered much attention until they were published in Kristeva (1969). They were then translated from French and appeared in Kristeva (1980) in English. See Alfaro (1996:268) and Kelly (2014:49) for further publication information.

[6] See Moyise (2002:418-419) and Kelly (2014:2-3) for discussion of the term's introduction in the field. The initial books using the term are Draisma (1989) and Hays (1989).

[7] See instead, e.g., Alfaro (1996); Cherney (2014:14-15); Estelle (2018:21-28, 327-335); Juvan (2008a; 2008b); Kelly (2014:48-61); Scheetz (2012:1-7); Stead (2009:18-29); and Tull (2000:66-73).

interconnected in that they build upon an underlying network of meaning; no word is spoken without "a history behind it" (Estelle, 2018:330). This extends to each character's voice, along with the narrator's, in a work of literature; each voice can stand alone and interact with the world around it, both inside and outside of the work (330). Kristeva applies this to literature at large and argues that all texts are interconnected: "any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another" (1980:66).[8] Any text can relate and connect to any other text.[9]

With this limitless connection between texts, Kristeva sees any text as an intersection between author, addressee(s), and other texts, regardless of whether those other texts predate or postdate the given text. If a text absorbs and transforms other texts, then the meaning for any one text must be found in relation to other texts. If the meaning for any given text is thus found outside of itself, and if countless other texts are impacting its meaning, then the text's author cannot be the final authority for its meaning. The search for a text's meaning must then come from the readers of the text and their understanding of the other texts that relate to the given text. This entirely synchronic and reader- and text-oriented understanding means that a diachronic understanding of what influenced the author in a text's creation becomes irrelevant (Cherney, 2014:14).[10] Ironically, Kristeva came to prefer the term 'transposition' instead of 'intertextuality' within ten years of the latter term's coinage because other authors frequently associated 'intertextuality' with studying a text's sources (Scheetz, 2012:6).

From this brief and broad summary of the term's introduction and original meaning, we now turn to the term's use within the field of biblical studies in the last few decades. As highlighted above by Tull, there is little agreement on what 'intertextuality' has come to mean.[11] 'Intertextuality' in biblical studies is generally understood as one (or more) of three things: a method, a category, or a theory.

To see intertextuality as a method is to study textual relationships by comparing two or more texts. Sommer's 1998 study of scriptural allusion in Isaiah 40-66 is one of the more prominent studies of HB/OT inner-biblical connections after Fishbane's 1985 *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Sommer puts 'intertextuality' and 'influence/allusion' on opposing ends of a

---

[8] See also Tull (2000:71).

[9] Cherney writes: "For Kristeva, every text is a reply to every single one of its predecessors, but it is more. A text is immediately absorbed into the same world as its predecessors…" (2014:14).

[10] Cf. Miller's brief summary, "The study of the dialogical nature of language, devoid of any fixation on tracing the influence of one text on another, is precisely the kind of study that Kristeva was advocating when she coined the term 'intertextuality'" (2011:286).

[11] Machacek observes in the field of (non-biblical) literary studies that the term 'intertextuality' has also gone through a transformation of meaning away from what Kristeva meant (2007:523-525).

literary-connection spectrum, with the former meaning synchronic analysis of texts and the latter diachronic analysis of texts. He understands intertextuality as an 'approach' and labels it as a 'method' (7). Sommer prefers a diachronic method for his study, but he understands intertextuality as a method, nevertheless (9). Kynes's book on Job's use of Psalms utilizes an "approach for identifying inner-biblical allusions and interpreting them…" and labels the approach 'intertextualities in dialogue' because he believes "the interpretation of allusions best lies in the interface between diachronic and synchronic approaches" (2012:29).[12] Barton states that in biblical studies, critics tend to take for granted that "intertextuality is a *method* or *approach* to the *interpretation* of texts," whether the term is used in a synchronic or diachronic sense, or, using the concepts Barton suggests, a spatial or temporal sense (2013:7, emphasis original).

Some biblical scholars understand intertextuality to be a category rather than a method. Noting the varied usage of the term, Christopher Hays believes "[i]ntertextuality is most helpful as a category… when it is defined broadly, as comprising both allusion and other possible relationships among texts" (2008:26). Multiple authors use the phrase 'umbrella term' to describe how intertextuality can be understood either as any type of connection between texts or as a grouping for literary analytical methods as Hays does above (Moyise, 2002:429-430; Lester, 2009:1; Stead, 2009:20; Kynes, 2012:20; 2013b:94; Jonker, 2013b:283 n. 30; Lester, 2015:4).

A few biblical scholars have identified intertextuality as a theory, not as a method or category of methods. Moore & Sherwood critique biblical scholarship, saying it has turned intertextuality into a method when intertextuality is not suited to be understood as such. Rather, intertextuality was originally meant to be and still is, a concept about textual meaning and how readers understand the relationships between texts, a type of literary epistemology (2011:33-36). Barton is convinced by Moore & Sherwood that intertextuality is not a method but "a theory of texts in general" and how humans understand the world and labels this understanding as 'hard' intertextuality as opposed to the 'soft' intertextuality of those who understand the term to be a method (2013:8-9). Tull also identifies intertextuality as a theory but states its varied usage requires most studies to outline and clarify methodology and terminology (2000:73). Ultimately, she concludes, "Intertextuality is more an angle of vision on textual production and reception than an exegetical methodology, more an insight than an ideology" (83).

With all these definitions of intertextuality, is there a moral imperative to use the term only as its creator intended? More than one scholar has argued that the term need not mean now, nor into perpetuity, what Kristeva originally meant. No one owns a patent on the term; all are free to use it

---

[12] Kynes's multi-step method forms the framework for the present study's process, but we do not use his label 'intertextualities in dialogue' for reasons explained below.

how they see fit (Tull, 2000:78). To be sure, there is an irony present that the term initially signified a non-author-oriented understanding of language and text. Adherence to any 'original' definition is contrary to the term's argument itself, despite Kristeva's own objections to its use in ways other than she intended (Stead, 2009:19; Carr, 2012:515-516).

Several biblical scholars have taken 'intertextuality' as their operative term and concept for their methodology and have argued for its use and usefulness. Nielsen admits her use of intertextuality does not align with Kristeva's original intent and even goes so far as to admit such uses can be seen as "abuse". Still, Nielsen uses the term and concept because it "places certain tools in my hand that make me a better textual reader" (2000:17). She begins her explanation of her intertextual reading with "the claim that no text comes into being or can be read as an isolated unit. It is always part of a network of texts" (18). She then outlines three phases of intertextual reading: one phase focused on the author and the author's intention as seen in the text, a second phase focused on the text and its history, and a third focused on the reader and the tradition the reader brings to the text (18-19). In her estimation, this allows the biblical critic the ability to read a text rightly with intertextual connections and account for and evaluate the text's multiple possible intertextual meanings.

Moyise categorizes five different uses of the term in biblical studies: 'intertextual echo', 'narrative intertextuality', 'exegetical intertextuality', 'dialogical intertextuality', and 'postmodern intertextuality' (2002). Moyise provides examples with each category of how intertextuality helps the reader understand each biblical passage. He concludes by admitting the difficulty with the term's use since it has many possible meanings. He suggests "that if scholars wish to continue to use the term, they need to clarify which 'type' of intertextuality they are using, so that readers can know what is being claimed" (418). Likewise, Stead sees value in the term's use, recognizes its different potential meanings and nuances, and describes three spectrums of features common to intertextual approaches: textual creation, textual meaning, and (textual) hermeneutics (2009:18-27). He "argu[es] for the validity of a variety of intertextual approaches in which the better approaches will depend on the particularities of the texts at hand" (27). Thus, he calls his method, 'a "Contextual" Intertextuality' (18).

Kynes offers a combination of arguments in favor of using the term 'intertextuality' (2012), incorporating consequentialism like Nielsen, a concession to current trends like Moyise, and a pluralist approach like Stead. Kynes interacts with Barton's 'soft' versus 'hard' intertextuality. He acknowledges Barton's warning against biblical scholars' use of 'intertextuality' creating potential misunderstanding with non-biblical scholars and encourages biblical scholars to engage with both

the method and theory of intertextuality (19-20).[13] That said, Kynes rebuts Barton's concern regarding potential "misunderstanding or perceptions of naivety and inconsequentiality from non-biblical scholars" by pointing to Kynes's own look at contemporary literary criticism (19). Several scholars outside of biblical studies work with intertextuality in a 'soft' methodological way or with a diachronic approach, like how Kynes does later in his study (19; cf. 2013a:204-205).[14] Kynes responds to those calling for the term's abandonment by arguing that the use of the term is now so widespread that a study with different related terms cannot avoid an association with 'intertextuality'.[15] Kynes doubts that any "terminological correction" would prove effective. From a pragmatic standpoint, "'intertextuality' fills an important void, since no word previously existed to encapsulate the many ways texts may be connected," and this recent widespread development of the term has provided some benefits over against the traditional ideas about textual influence (2012:20).[16] Lastly, various intertextual approaches work well together and provide the best way to address textual allusions (20-21). Kynes's movement back and forth between synchronic and diachronic approaches in evaluating allusions makes his 'intertextualities in dialogue' a sensible designation for his method given his preference for the term 'intertextuality'. Kynes is right that 'intertextuality', with its myriad of meanings as noted above, does enjoy widespread usage. He is also correct that 'intertextuality' will presumably find an association with most if not all biblical studies concerning how two or more texts relate to one another, regardless of the terminology those studies use.

Nevertheless, we do not follow Kynes that 'intertextuality' or 'intertextualities in dialogue' is the best term for the present study's methodology.[17] The nature of Kynes's arguments makes them difficult to refute. Kynes does not engage with the arguments of Miller (2011) and Carr (2012) but seems to reject the premise held by them that intertextuality carries with it certain synchronic and reader-oriented assumptions about how texts are related. Instead, Kynes pushes aside any insistence for terminological assignments based on a "traditional" understanding of concepts by saying that 'intertextuality' is acceptable to use however one defines it because so many authors use the term in different and sometimes overlapping ways. As Tull notes above, no one owns the patent on 'intertextuality' and what underlying assumptions are associated with it. How then can one argue

---

[13] Though Barton's essay was published the year following Kynes's book, Kynes was an editor for the volume in which Barton's essay appears. Kynes had access to the essay and lists it as "forthcoming" (2012:19 n.12).

[14] Here Kynes refers in his 2012 book to a future article of his (2013a) as "forthcoming."

[15] Kynes notes Sommer (1998) and Lyons (2009) avoid the term 'intertextuality' because of its multiple meanings and that Miller (2011) and Carr (2012) contend 'intertextuality' should be reserved for synchronic, reader-oriented studies while other terms are more appropriate for diachronic, author-oriented studies (2012:20).

[16] Cf. Floyd (2003:226).

[17] Instead, we follow Sommer, Lyons, Miller, Carr, Meek, and others. See below.

against the use of 'intertextuality' (or any given term) if the term's definition and assumptions cannot be established? Meek's strong case against the use of the term does not hold if an interlocutor disagrees that the term carries with it particular innate meaning and foci (2014:282-284).[18]

The other aspect of Kynes's argument that is difficult to refute is his contention that the term is so widely used presently that its use in future studies is inevitable. The difficulty with this argument (and any related counter-argument) is: how does one define or quantify the nature of ubiquity? How does one measure the extent of a term's widespread use and thus make a compelling case in an argument? Related to the concept of widespread usage, how does one argue, given a term's varied meanings and conceptual undertones as intertextuality has, that a term's meaning ceases to be associated by default with one concept (that intertextuality is a theory, or that intertextuality is firstly related to a synchronic and reader-oriented method of comparing texts) and is now instead associated with a different concept (however else an author might choose to define and use the term, or a diachronic method, or a diachronic/synchronic hybrid method)? These are far-reaching questions unto themselves that this study cannot address.

Instead, this study aims for the more attainable goal of arguing *for* a different term, rather than *against* the use of 'intertextuality'. We do not argue for another term in isolation but do so building on the work of others. The two other significant textual-connection terms coming to the fore in the last forty years of biblical studies have been 'inner-biblical exegesis' and 'inner-biblical allusion'.[19] The next section briefly surveys how the study of textual connections in the HB/OT has progressed since 1985 and how that progression influences this study's terminological choices.

### 2.2.2 – A Survey of the Study of HB/OT Inner-biblical Connections

The study of HB/OT inner-biblical connections has come through two streams of focus within the last century, "from post-biblical interpretative traditions back to the Bible, or from the pre-stages of the biblical texts towards the Bible in its final form" (Jonker, 2013b:276). For our purposes, we label them 'literary' and 'historical/redactional', respectively, and review the latter first.

---

[18] Meek makes three arguments against the use of intertextuality, all of which assume an understanding of intertextuality close to or matching its original use: (1) intertextuality connotes more than references to texts, it can also include aural and cultural suppositions; (2) intertextuality is not interested in diachronic matters such as direction of dependence; (3) intertextuality does not require criteria to determine the connectedness of texts.

[19] Meek differentiates the two terms this way: "The primary difference in these two methodologies is that inner-biblical exegesis argues that the receptor text has in some way modified the source text, whereas inner-biblical allusion argues that the receptor text alludes to the source text with no attempt at modification [of the source text]" (2014:290). These terms are discussed below in 2.2.2.

Schmid overviews the development of inner-biblical interpretation through a historical and/or redactional mindset, focusing mostly on European scholarship (2000). The first half of the twentieth century saw in inner-biblical studies a focus on the Pentateuch and the Prophets with an uncertainty of what to do with the editors of the biblical text; were they to be seen as of secondary importance to the original authors or essential to the literary development of the text?[20] Editors would receive more (positive) attention in the second half of the century (8). Von Rad's *Theologie des Alten Testaments* helped shift the viewpoint of the Prophets from later biblical writers who distorted earlier works to authors who were providing sacred interpretations of earlier writings (10). Through the 1960s and 1970s, more focus was given to the literary development of the text through redactional layers, as seen in inner-biblical interpretation. Fishbane published in 1985 what Schmid calls "das Standardwerk der innerbiblischen Schriftauslegung" (2000:13-14). Fishbane's *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* is discussed below as a significant influence on the literary stream; for Schmid's focus on the historical development of the text, Fishbane did not see literary ranges of inner-biblical interpretation. Rather, Fishbane introduced four thematic categories by which later authors of the HB/OT interpreted earlier texts: Scribal Comments and Corrections, Legal Exegesis, Aggadic Exegesis, and Mantological Exegesis (Schmid, 2000:14). Schmid observes that although diachrony is not without controversy in biblical studies, there is a movement to see later works interpreting earlier ones in a productive process (19). Schmid concludes his essay with a discussion of how the literary presentation (not just text-based interpretation) of 1-2 Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehehmiah seems to indicate a general reception of Genesis – 2 Kings and the Prophets (20). A historical and redactional emphasis in inner-biblical interpretation continues to the present as seen in surveys (e.g., Jonker, 2014), books (e.g., Nihan, 2007; Schmid, 2008), and articles (e.g., Loader, 2008; Schmid, 2012; 2014; and Jonker, 2017).

The second recent stream of inner-biblical interpretation is a literary one. This stream began with Fishbane's *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Though he "did not describe literary

---

[20] Cf. Kugel: "Long before Wellhausen and the higher anti-Semitism, 'early' in the Bible was simply better than 'late,' and consequently primordial history better than later retelling, First Isaiah better than Second, and so forth. Behind this stands not only the question of divine inspiration (for earlier narratives are presumably closer to the moment of divine-human interaction which they recount, just as the identified—and hence *real* prophet's *ipsissima verba* are 'more authentic' than the unidentified prophet's words, or third-person accounts of what the prophet said), but as well the Protestant abhorrance [sic] of intermediaries: were not redactors, revisers, and similar interlopers quite analogous to the Pope and the centuries of benighted misreading he represented, an obstacle that stood between the modern, inspired reader and the very word (or deed) of God in the fullness in which it was first perceived by man? And so the Protestant task (and consequently that of modern biblical scholarship) has always been to cast such interlopers out, to recover the authentic (or 'most authentic') text, oracle, event, and throw the rest away. Little wonder, then, that the biblical text that seeks to interpret or elaborate upon an earlier biblical text has been viewed ipso facto as of secondary importance, and that the processes of interpretation and assimilation that underlie such acts were for some time generally judged unworthy of scrutiny" (1987:270, emphasis original).

dependence in terms conventional to non-biblical literary study of allusion" (Lester, 2009:90), Fishbane has been called "the developer of inner-biblical exegesis" (Scheetz, 2012:10) and "[t]he godfather of the subject" (Crouch, 2014:26). Fishbane is credited with sparking the renewed interest in HB/OT textual connections from a literary vantage in the last forty years.[21] His study stemmed from seeking to understand the origin of rabbinic traditions of interpretation. Fishbane's goal was to examine the HB/OT to see how it interpreted itself and then how the rabbinic traditions developed from that example (1985:2-3).[22] As noted above, Fishbane categorized the various ways the HB/OT refers and interacts with itself into four areas, thus providing a framework to understand how later biblical authors worked with earlier writings. The sheer scope of his work is astounding, mentioning passages from every book of the HB/OT except Ruth and Song of Solomon.[23] Schultz provides this brief summation: "Fishbane's volume is exemplary in displaying a rigorous, though not unflawed, methodology and an extensive bibliography throughout" (1999:97).

A work of this magnitude does not come without criticism, and Fishbane's is no exception. No standard methodology has come to replace his, but Fishbane's methodology and terminology have not been widely followed (Leonard, 2016:125).[24] His terminology is difficult to use since it relies heavily on two closely related Latin words with potentially overlapping definitions (Kugel, 1987:273-274). His categories are perhaps either arbitrary or forced on the HB/OT from later rabbinic practices (274-277). One may also question how accurately the term 'inner-biblical exegesis' represents many of the examples Fishbane cites (280).[25]

In light of Fishbane's work, two further streams following different literary critics can be detected within the literary stream: "the Ben-Porat trajectory" and "the Hollander trajectory"

---

[21] Cf. Kugel's review of Fishbane (1985): "But this book is far more than a mere recapitulation of his previous work: it is nothing less than an attempt to define the field" (1987:271). Lyons writes: "While a few earlier studies hinted at the possibilities, the current interest in creative text-referencing is largely due to M. Fishbane's enormously influential work *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*" (2009:11). Cherney adds "Recognition that the voices heard in the Bible are aware of each other is certainly not new. Since Michael Fishbane's 1985 *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, however, there has been increased attention to what this inter-textual dialogue means for exegesis" (2014:7). See also Schniedewind (1995:540) and Grohmann & Kim (2019:7-8).

[22] Fishbane lays out his investigative questions in his Introduction: "When did the Jewish exegetical tradition come to be formed? What literary and historical factors contributed to its birth? Is the development of an exegetical tradition in post-biblical Judaism solely the product of internal tensions—fostered by competing sects with different claims on the biblical heritage, or do its roots also go back to the biblical past itself?" (1985:2). Cf. Scheetz, "Fishbane's expressed purpose is to demonstrate that the sort of exegesis practiced after the close of the canon actually has its foundation in the biblical canon itself" (2012:18).

[23] Cf. Lester: "Nonetheless, response to Fishbane's work has shaped all ensuing discussion of allusion in biblical studies, and the work is so exhaustive and well indexed that many later claims of inner-biblical allusion are seen to find early expression in Fishbane's work" (2009:90).

[24] Lester declares a "relative vacuum [has been] left by the field's general rejection of Fishbane's categories…" (2013:446).

[25] Cf. Leonard (2016:126); Schniedewind (1995:541); and Sommer (1998:23).

(Lester, 2013:446). The Ben-Porat trajectory begins by distinguishing the terms 'inner-biblical exegesis' and 'inner-biblical allusion'; the former has one text explaining another, while the latter activates an older text to generate meaning in the alluding text for the reader who can discern the trope (446).[26] Ben-Porat defines literary allusion as "a device for the simultaneous activation of two texts," differentiates literary allusion from "allusion in general," and argues a reader who can recognize a literary allusion in a given text proceeds through four stages when interacting with said alluding and evoked texts (1976:107-116).[27] Perri demonstrates that allusion need not be covert and enumerates her own five-fold sequence through which a reader goes when interpreting allusion (1978). Kronfeld reviews Ben-Porat's work, identifies five key features of allusion, and reiterates the possibility of both alluding and evoked texts mutually reinterpreting one another (1985). Conte understands allusion as a rhetorical trope akin to metaphor (1986). Pucci adds a strong emphasis on the reader and the role the reader's competency plays in allusion (1998). Sommer was one of the first from the field of biblical studies to engage with Ben-Porat's definition of allusion and her stages and other ideas from literary criticism scholars; he contributed (among other things) a differentiation of echo from allusion (1998:15-17). Following Sommer's example (and thus engaging with Ben-Porat and others in literary criticism) are biblical studies works such as Schultz (1999); Vassar (2007); Lyons (2009); Kynes (2012); Lee (2015); and Lester (2015). Other studies like Stead (2009) and Gibson (2016) engage with Sommer's work but do not engage directly with Ben-Porat and other literary critics.

The Hollander trajectory derives its name from literary critic John Hollander (1981). Lester records that the Hollander trajectory developed alongside, yet separate from, the Ben-Porat trajectory, working with an understanding of 'allusion' more akin to the "allusion in general" referenced by Ben-Porat (2013:448). Hollander's allusion or echo (he is free with his terminology) can be understood as one text making an indirect reference to another text. Hollander's approach is

---

[26] Sommer explains the difference succinctly: "An exegetical text clarifies or transforms an earlier text; an allusive text utilizes an earlier text" (1998:17). Later, Sommer offers another distinction between the two: "A writer alludes to an older text for some purpose in his own text, not to suggest a particular understanding of the old one" (30). Cf. Kugel (1987); Eslinger (1992); and Sommer (1996b). The present study focuses more on these allusive qualities of textual inner-biblical connections than the exegetical ones, so 'inner-biblical exegesis' is not the primary term for this study. See 2.2.4 and 2.2.5 on this study's use of 'inner-biblical allusion'.

[27] Barker observes that Ben-Porat's use of "two texts" in her definition "is somewhat limiting since it is possible for a text to allude to more than one other text, even within the same reference. For example, it would be limiting to say that that Jonah 4:2-4 alludes *only* to Exod 34:6-7 without acknowledging its relationship with Joel 2:12-14" (2018:703, emphasis original). Other authors also use the language of "two" or "both" texts (e.g., Gibson [2016:33 n. 45] and Kynes [2012:55, 59]). For the purposes of this study, we will understand such references to mean "two (or more) texts" rather than note the limitation at each occurrence. For more information on Ben-Porat's four stages, see 2.2.4.3.

diachronic but sensitive to a reader-orientation as he does not overtly distinguish between author intention and connections made by the reader.

While Hollander might not be as well known in the field of biblical studies as Ben-Porat, Richard Hays is, and perhaps even more so. Hays, in his important 1989 book *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, works with Hollander's understanding of allusion or echo and develops a now well-known set of methodological criteria to determine the presence of an allusion/echo (29-32).[28] Hollander's impact on Hays is evident, and Hays himself attests to Hollander's influence (Lester, 2013:448).[29] Hays shares Hollander's freedom and flexibility in terminology, sometimes using allusion and echo to mean indirect references (à la Hollander) and sometimes the activation of texts as understood by the Ben-Porat trajectory (Lester, 2013:448-449).[30] Hays admits at various points that he is more interested in "good readings" rather than a theory or method (1989:21, 32).[31] Hays shares Hollander's diachronic approach while recognizing the reader's importance in interpretation (33).

Despite the apparent differences, there are overlaps between these two literary streams (Lester, 2013:449-450). The methodological tests developed by Hays have come to influence a wide range of scholars from both literary streams and from both NT and HB/OT studies. Certain concepts from Hollander and Hays correspond well to Ben-Porat's fourth stage.[32] These overlaps provide a way forward for the student of inner-biblical connections. The next section explores further overlaps between seemingly opposing viewpoints on how to approach inner-biblical connections so that we may define the study's operative terms.

### 2.2.3 – False Dichotomies

As overlaps exist between the two literary streams above, so overlaps exist between the historical and literary streams and between synchronic/reader-oriented and diachronic/author-oriented approaches to understanding textual connections.[33] These sets of streams and approaches do not exist on isolated and parallel tracks but on connected spectrums that allow the student of inner-biblical connections to navigate back and forth, enhancing a study's results.

---

[28] Hays's "tests" are discussed further below in 2.3.

[29] Cf. Hays (1989:18-21, 32; 2005:3 n. 5, 34-35, 43, 166, 173).

[30] E.g., Hays (1989:155). Cf. Moyise (2002:420).

[31] Cf. Lester (2013:449).

[32] Namely, Hollander's "cave of resonant signification" and Hays's understanding of metalepsis.

[33] See Hong (2013) for clarification regarding the use of synchrony and diachrony within the historical stream versus their usage within the literary stream. Since the present study locates itself more in the literary stream, those understandings of synchrony (reader-orientation) and diachrony (author-orientation) are used throughout.

Throughout the twentieth century and into the twenty-first, a debate continues in various scholastic areas regarding the role historical (and/or redactional) and literary approaches play in the study of the HB/OT. Jonker (2013c:1-3) surveys four areas of debate (Historicity, Textual growth and/or composition, Intentional fallacy, and Contextual) and demonstrates that "[h]istorical and contextual understanding therefore cuts both ways, and perhaps even shapes the 'story of two ways' into a story of one way with various, complementary, lanes" (6).[34] Loader observes that one cannot altogether remove the historical from a literary HB/OT study because any literary study by its nature chooses one of several possible historical forms of the Hebrew text to study (2008:100-101). Whether we consider layers of text in a study or only the one text we examine, we must see the complementarity of the historical and literary (118).[35] Lester writes in his survey of inner-biblical interpretation: "The felt need to choose between a historical approach and a literary critical one is acknowledged today as a false dichotomy and an artifact of literary criticism's 'adolescence' in biblical studies" (2013:450).[36] The literary can positively impact the historical and vice versa.[37]

Likewise, there has been much debate whether studies on inner-biblical connections should utilize a synchronic approach (often associated with reader-orientation) or a diachronic approach (often associated with author-orientation). For example, van Wolde describes in her 1989 essay a "diachronic approach of comparative exegesis" that focuses on the author, the "web of meanings" the author spins together that "the reader merely has to follow…", and the causality between the evoked and alluding texts. She chides scholars who use the relatively new labels of intertextuality while practicing this "old comparative approach". Van Wolde contrasts this with a method she commends, a "synchronic approach of intertextual exegesis" that centers on the reader, sees meaning coming from the reader's interaction with a text rather than from an autonomous author,

---

[34] Jonker further concludes: "… history matters in our interpretations because contextual reception is all that we have available! Interpretation without a historical dimension cannot be contextual; and interpretation without a sensitivity to context cannot be historical" (2013c:6).

[35] Cf. Kawashima (2007:328-329), who argues that there is a temporal dimension to any artistic endeavor.

[36] Lester continues: "Inner-biblical interpretation, in its diachronic orientation and commitment to sensitive discernment of troping as a strategy intended by the text, reminds the scholar that study of literary poetics need not entail an abandonment of interest in the history reflected in the biblical text: 'An appreciation of [an instance of inner-biblical interpretation]… contributes to the historian of Israelite religion as well as to the literary critic'…" (2013:450).

[37] Cf. Schmid's comments (2000:13-14) on Fishbane (1985), as noted above. Schmid also summarizes how the historical can help literary analysis: "Redaktionsgeschichte ist als innerbiblische Rezeptionsgeschichte beschreibbar, deren Rekonstruktion die innerbiblischen theologischen Diskurslagen in ihren historischen Differenzierungen wieder zum Vorschein bringen kann" (Schmid, cited in Jonker 2013b:279). See too Miller's comments (2011:303) on Bautch (2007).

and understands the relationship between connected texts as indirect and simultaneously analogous instead of direct and linear.[38]

With the debate has come a pessimism saying the two approaches cannot work together. Miller recognizes that some are trying to find a middle way between the two approaches and lauds those authors for their attempts. However, he strongly doubts much will be gained: "any attempt to integrate the two primary approaches to intertextual study seems destined to fail, since it cannot withstand the criticism already voiced by many scholars…" (2011:292-293). Miller does not call for one approach over the other but recognizes both are helpful and belong in HB/OT research.[39] Nevertheless, Miller reports the situation as he sees it: "The debate over the proper approach, however, seems to be at an impasse. Attempts to reconcile the seemingly disparate author-oriented and reader-oriented models have not attracted adherents, and hope for such a solution seems bleak." He acknowledges not everyone shares his pessimism, quoting Tull's celebration of differing approaches, but quickly returns to his dour outlook (304).[40]

This study does not share Miller's viewpoint nor his overall assessment of scholarship's lack of interest in reconciling the two approaches. Miller focuses on the flaws of each approach and the frustrations experienced by the proponents of each when interacting with the advocates for the other (304). He could instead focus on how each approach enhances and supports the weaknesses of the

---

[38] Another example can be found in Eslinger's argument for a synchronic approach, critiquing Fishbane's assumption of diachrony (1992:53-57; cf. Jonker, 2013b:282), and how Sommer (1996b:479-483); Hutton (2007:276); and Leonard (2008:257) push back against Eslinger's negative view of Fishbane's diachronic examination of literary connections. See Tull (2000) and Miller (2011) for additional examples. Miller comments on the heated nature of the debate: "The lack of discussion about methodology, typical of many recent studies on intertextuality, should not be regarded as a sign of the author's ignorance about such matters. More likely, it is a reflection of the author's reluctance to expose him or herself to the harsh critiques levied against those who have articulated principles of intertextual reading. Scholars from both camps have traded barbs with one another, each dismissing the approach of the other as either incongruous with biblical scholarship, or built upon faulty premises (e.g., van Wolde 1989; Eslinger 1992; Schoors 2000; Leonard 2008). The consequent timidity in defining one's methodology is not surprising, although a small number of scholars are trying to ameliorate the problem by forging a middle path between these allegedly antithetical approaches" (2011:291). He later describes this field of biblical studies as "fractured by ideological rifts" (292).

[39] Strollo follows Miller in understanding both methods are contrasted and not complementary. Strollo does see value in each, depending on the text(s) under examination (2017:191-193, 201). She writes, "Recognizing the best methods for the right texts is part of the process of intertextual study… Perhaps it is not so important to consent to one method or approach to intertextuality. Rather, scholars should model their research on the biblical texts themselves and embrace the myriad of methods and approaches that are available" (201). In her article on textual connections between Song of Solomon and Lamentations, she concludes that because dating Song of Solomon and Lamentations is difficult, an author-oriented approach is "almost impossible" and "a synchronic reading of the two texts would be most fruitful" (193).

[40] Tull celebrates different approaches by noting that "biblical scholarship has always benefited from the eclecticism of its practitioners, and trying to fit all scholarship into intertextual categories may lead to the missing of some very great insights that proceed from a technically proficient examination of a sliver of text from all angles" (2000:75).

other. We agree with Kynes, who points to critics who have effectively used elements of both methods together and states:

> Instead of defining intertextual approaches in a binary way, a scale or spectrum is more appropriate for categorizing the range of approaches to intertextuality, or "intertextualities." Instead of being mutually exclusive, diachronic and synchronic intertextualities may be mutually beneficial, even symbiotic. If intertextuality is defined only in its contrasting extremes, those extremes may "assume two different cultures of understanding" with the two sides "separated by an unbridgeable chasm," but the progressives [those advocating for synchrony] also risk being lost in an infinite text, while the traditionalists [those advocating for diachrony] are vulnerable to the accusation of merely using "trendy" terminology. However, an intertextual approach in the space between these poles would offer powerful hermeneutical insight not available through either individually (2012:23-24).

Kynes sketches out how diachronic and synchronic approaches could benefit each other (24-26) and then summarizes the mutually beneficial relationship:

> Thus, a diachronic approach can benefit intertextual interpretation by limiting the infinite number of possible intertexts to a more manageable number made up only of those that could have been conceivably intended by the author. On the other hand, attention to the synchronic meaning of the text frees the traditional approach from merely being "source hunting." It puts the emphasis on the effect the text's interaction with those sources has on its meaning, and even on the reciprocal effect that interaction may have on our understanding of the source, as well as its reverberation through both (26-27).

Several scholars in the last twenty years call for an interpretative method that combines synchrony and diachrony. Kynes discusses Schultz (1999); Pyeon (2003); and Stead (2009); and how they support the idea of such a method but do not specify one. Kynes then cites but does not discuss three more scholars who support his view.[41] To this list of scholars, we add several more. As noted above, Tull speaks of both methods (using different terms) and sees the benefit of examining a text from multiple angles (2000:75). She highlights later in her essay how the combination of synchrony and diachrony is advantageous to the biblical scholar (80-81). Cherney (2014:4) and Sweeney (2017:134) advocate for "a middle course" and a "synthesis", respectively, between author- and reader-oriented approaches to allusion and textual interpretation. Lee affirms an approach that is both synchronic and diachronic and that "the author is still an agent of meaning,

[41] Alkier (2009:8); Grohmann (2009:122); and Moyise (2009:32).

though not the only one" (2015:23, 24). Boda asserts that "attention to both the diachronic and synchronic dimensions… underlies [his] own work" (2017:11). Estelle's approach aims to take both the author and reader into account, "for the two must be wedded for a full understanding of meaning" (2018:26). Hong does not explicitly argue for a literary method of inner-biblical interpretation combining synchrony and diachrony but does affirm the value of both in biblical studies (2013:531-539).[42]

Thus, we see there are those in biblical studies who advocate for and pursue an interpretative method combining synchrony and diachrony. Such a combination provides an excellent way forward for HB/OT inner-biblical interpretation. The following examines 'allusion' and advocates for why it is the best term to incorporate both diachronic and synchronic elements in the present study's investigation of inner-biblical connections between 2 Chr 10-36 and Exodus.

### 2.2.4 – Allusion

In a study on inner-biblical allusion, we must establish our understanding of 'allusion'. Allusion is ubiquitous; it appears daily in our conversations, writing, art, and jokes (Alter, 1989:111-112). As such, we may approach it with little more than intuition, take it for granted, and think all agree on its meaning, purpose, and function (Ben-Porat, 1976:105). However, once one enters the realm of literary studies, one finds that is not the case.

---

[42] Hong's model for biblical interpretation is a complex, multi-dimensional approach incorporating both historical and literary foci that interact with the author, text, and reader across pre-final-form, final-form, and post-final-form textual stages. Hong states his "purpose is simply to demonstrate how synchrony and diachrony, when used in conjunction with the three interpretive axes of author, text, and reader, can be useful as metacritical tools in biblical criticism. They can be useful not only in enhancing mutual understanding among different approaches but also in forcing the individual critics to think more clearly about their stance in terms of its exact placement within this larger interpretive domain" (2013:537). Hong's model is intriguing, but his article stays in the theoretical realm and does not demonstrate an application of his method to a biblical text or texts. If he provided an example of how to apply his method, it would magnify its contribution to the field of biblical studies. Prinsloo values both synchronic and diachronic methods in assessing textual connections between Habakkuk and Isaiah but seems to understand diachrony in more historical/redactional terms (like one of Hong's categorical dimensions) than literary ones (2018:667-670, 684-687). Literary critic Machacek discusses authorial intent and how multiple approaches help allusive interpretation but, like Prinsloo, seems to understand diachrony more in terms of a historical moment of a text and its interpretation than the direction of dependence between texts and their respective and relative dating (2007:531).

We first distinguish between '(general) allusion' and 'literary allusion'.[43] Allusion, in a general sense, is an "indirect reference to a known fact" (105).[44] This is the type of allusion we find so often in our daily lives. Literary allusion, while admittedly a term with imperfections (105-107), is the operative concept under examination throughout biblical and non-biblical literary studies when investigating 'allusion'. So too, literary allusion is our pursuit in this study; for our purposes, hereafter, when we speak of allusion without a qualifier, we mean 'literary allusion'.

Literary allusion is a term and concept that has as many definitions as there are literary critics. Uniformity in the field has not been reached because of its various aspects and nuances. Our goal in this section is not to come to an agreed-upon standard definition but rather to establish the critical components of allusion and discuss how those components contribute to its chosen usage throughout the remainder of the study.

Sometimes in biblical studies on allusion, allusion is defined by placing it upon a spectrum (or in a Venn diagram) between other literary devices (such as citation, quotation, echo, and trace) and explaining what it is not (Stead, 2009:20-22; Lester, 2013:445; Gibson, 2016:39-40; Kynes, 2012:31).[45] Though these four terms may have their own differing definitions, the first two are typically understood as more explicit references to other texts and the latter two as less explicit. It is beneficial to understand how allusion relates to other literary devices, so we recognize the value of these visual ideas. However, in our study, defining allusion negatively only provides limited assistance.[46] As we see below, some biblical scholars have turned to literary and communication studies to help understand allusion.[47]

What then is literary allusion? Zevit provides an informal definition:

> Allusions belong to the creative side of literary productions and most, not all, authors (of poems, sermon, political speeches, jokes, psalms, prophecies, histories and so on) who make them assume that they will be appreciated by the receiver of the text and

---

[43] Contra Coombs (1984) who argues for only one type of allusion rather than literary and non-literary allusion and creates a system for understanding all allusions under one rubric. See Cherney for strengths and weaknesses of Coombs's arguments (2014:18-19). Coombs argues that a split understanding of literary and non-literary allusion is too complicated and should be simplified. Yet in the creation of a new way to understand allusion, Coombs does not simplify how one understands allusion. Coombs's system has not been followed in studies of allusion and is not followed in the present study.

[44] Alter also identifies allusion in general as an "indirect reference" (1989:111). See also Machacek: "If a poet mentions a little known fact or makes a roundabout reference to a well-known fact, we speak of this as an allusion" (2007:526). Later, he states two general allusions are "simply circumlocutions" (526).

[45] See Stead (2009:22) for short, introductory definitions of these terms.

[46] Cf. Lester (2015:8).

[47] Kelly explains the value of literary exploration of biblical texts' connection, "By applying literary theory to biblical studies' quest to identify literary allusions, the inadequacies of our assumptions are revealed and alternative areas of emphasis come into focus" (2017:37).

> experienced aesthetically. Allusions, used this way, are friendly winks of the inner, literary eye that an author directs to her audience. Allusions traffic in insider-information to enrich a work by connecting it to prior works and to create a slight bond between author and reader on the basis of their common knowledge. But allusions need not be obvious at all (2017:2).[48]

This explanation reveals multiple vital components to an allusion: texts ("literary productions"), an author with intent ("traffic in insider-information to enrich a work… and to create a slight bond…"), and a reader ("receiver of the text") with a shared commonality with the author and the ability to appreciate the textual creation. A fuller understanding of allusion necessitates that we understand not only what an allusion is (with its constituent parts), but the possible reason(s) an author alludes. If we are only looking at allusion from a synchronic standpoint, then we need only be concerned with *what* an allusion is. However, if we are going to include a diachronic framework in our understanding of allusion and discuss the author's intent, then we must also seek *why* an author alludes.

Before discussing the components of allusion, we must address one additional terminological issue in allusion studies. The word 'allusion' typically signifies both the (later) text, which refers to the other text(s), as well as the entire association of texts itself (Machacek, 2007:528-529; cf. 2001:290). While it is certainly possible to understand the distinctions between the whole and the part contextually, some scholars have suggested additional terms to clarify allusion studies.[49] Of the options, each having their own strengths and weaknesses, this study utilizes the phrases 'alluding text' and 'evoked text' of Ben-Porat (1976:110) and Kronfeld (1985:146) and the nouns 'spur' and 'reprise' of Machacek (2007:529-530).

#### 2.2.4.1 – The Text(s)

The first component of a literary allusion is the text, or rather, the texts. A literary allusion consists of two or more texts simultaneously activated by a signal in one of the texts; the signal can be simple or complex and points to the other text(s) (Ben-Porat, 1976:107-108). Lester explains this concept by discussing phrases in Dan 11 that indicate a connection to Isa 10:

> This terse and cryptic explanation provides the necessary "irrelevance" to its context, jarring the reader and encouraging her, in recognition of a rhetorical trope, to look for

---

[48] See also these pithy definitions: Literary allusion is a "phraseological adaptation" and an "evocation… in one text of an antecedent literary text" (Machacek, 2007:526; Alter, 1989:112). Lester suggests we use 'allusion' "solely for proposed instances wherein the use of the older text by the newer constitutes a text-intended figurative trope akin to metaphor" (2013:450).

[49] See Machacek for a short summary of prior suggestions (2007:529). Cf. van Wolde (1989:45).

> understanding outside this text. Once the reader recognizes the source of these two marking phrases, the words will denote doubly, signifying not only in their context but in the literary context of the marked phrases in the evoked phrases (2015:65).

These ideas from Ben-Porat and Lester highlight that in allusion, there are one or more literary characteristics in the alluding text that prompt the reader to think a reference has been made to an evoked text. These indicative characteristics can be many things: a term that seems out of place due to its infrequent use in the immediate text, a term unique to the corpus as a whole, a particular grammatical construction, or recognizable lexical phrase(s). These characteristics go by many names (depending on the nature of each characteristic), but well-known and oft-used is Ben-Porat's appellation 'marker' (1976:108). The marker can and usually does have a possible "un-allusive" meaning within the world of the alluding text (Perri, 1978:300). If a marker seems incongruous to the alluding text's context (be it for lexical, grammatical, or syntactical reasons), one may understand this marker as an 'irrelevance' prompting the reader to think a literary trope is present, presumably allusive in nature (Conte, cited in Lester, 2013:447).[50] A marker has generally been regarded as tacit (perhaps due in part to the influence of Miner [1965; 1994], perhaps due to the indirect nature of general allusion) but may be subtle or overt.[51] Another key aspect of an allusion's texts is the diachronic relationship between them. When an author refers to another text, there is an implicit temporal relationship between the alluding and evoked texts (Hutton, 2007:276-277).[52] Other types of literary studies may downplay or disregard the diachronic aspect of textual connections, but for allusion, diachrony is an inherent factor.

#### 2.2.4.2 – The Author

The second component of a literary allusion is the author. An author using allusion shares a common language and cultural tradition with the author's audience and intends the marker to be recognizable by the reader(s), so the reader(s) can recognize the source text (Perri, 1978:300).[53] The author may use the literary device of allusion simply for an aesthetic reason like the enjoyment of the author and reader (similar to the positive feeling of understanding a joke), but our default assumption is the author does so for some rhetorical or strategic end (Alter, 1989:116; Sommer,

---

[50] See also Edenburg (1998:68) and Lester (2015:62-63). Carr labels this phenomenon a "blind motif" (2017:46).

[51] Throughout her article, Perri demonstrates that an allusion need not be covert (1978). Cf. Lester (2013:447).

[52] The specific dating of texts is not needed to establish a temporal relationship. Hutton concludes, "The recognition of allusion is, therefore, possible only in a context in which a temporal order can be assigned (or at least, assumed) for two texts" (2007:277). Cf. Machacek (2007:525, 532-533) and Loader (2008:100-101).

[53] An author may certainly create an allusion that is not recognizable to the reader or solely for the author's own enjoyment, but we will not address such situations in this study. See Zevit (2017:2-30).

1998:19; Zevit, 2017:2; Gibson, 2016:41; Lester, 2015:7). The possible rhetorical ends are numerous and may explain the intended goal(s) an author has in alluding.[54]

However, for what reason does an author use a literary device like allusion? Could not authors achieve their intended goals via other means? Lester says the author invites the reader through allusion to participate in "an imaginative co-production of meaning" (2015:7). Lester praises the author for doing so, calling it a courageous act, but does not explain *why* the author does so (8). Why does an author risk reliance on another to complete meaning production? What does the author (and reader) gain by producing meaning together in the use of allusion? Kalimi points in the right direction: "A linguistic unit is repeated in order to make a connection in the reader's mind between the text currently being read and a specific text elsewhere and *to maximize the potential power of the text*" (2005b:194, emphasis added). There is power in allusion.[55] When a reader takes part in the meaning-making process with the author by recognizing and appreciating the allusion, not only is a bond formed or strengthened between reader and author (as noted above in Zevit's informal definition of allusion), but potential power in the text is activated. The reader now has partial ownership of the text's meaning along with the author and has contributed to the communication event.[56]

Communication theory, specifically relevance theory, also helps explain why an author alludes.[57] Cherney understands writing, and thus allusion, as a communication event and explains relevance theory's pragmatic approach to the trope: "allusion demonstrates an author's belief that in this way s/he can impact the reader's context significantly at a reasonable cost to the reader in processing effort" (2014:20). For example, many NT allusions to HB/OT texts evoke whole segments of the spur's setting.[58] According to relevance theory, "such an allusion is an economical way to offer a reader a broad array of contextual effects" (20). Not only is allusion powerful, but it

---

[54] Hutton speaks of one possible, general rhetorical end: "To provide the reader/intended audience with a fuller appreciation of the allusive text's significance, without explicitly divulging that significance" (2007:277). Leonard summarizes possible purposes enumerated by Sommer: "to bolster some claim of the later author, to make his message more easily understood, or to create analogy" (2016:12). Also summarizing Sommer, Cherney says: "The alluding author may be attempting to position his/her work in relation to an older, known work; claiming similar authority for the new work; seeking admission into the same canon; or even juxtaposing two texts precisely in order to make their differences manifest" (2014:21). See also Crouch (2014:28) regarding the use of allusion for contrast.

[55] Cf. Pucci who says, "The etymology of allusion… well suggests the power and authority afforded the full-knowing reader in making the allusion mean" (1998:46). We discuss below Pucci's views on the role of the reader in allusion.

[56] Cf. Reed & Kinsley (2008:253).

[57] For more about relevance theory, see Pattemore (2002; 2011; 2013a; 2013b). Cf. Cherney (2014:19-22).

[58] Hutton discusses this type of phenomenon in summarizing Ben-Porat's fourth stage: "In short, the actualized allusion brings to bear on the marking text not just the themes and meaning of the specific marked elements but the themes and meanings of the marked text as a whole" (2007:277).

can be efficient.[59] Why should authors spell out their thoughts and feelings in straightforward detail when an allusion could potentially increase the impact of the writing at an efficient "cost"? Another insight relevance theory provides is that, by alluding, an author has conveyed a certain appraisal of the reader to the reader. The author has communicated a certain level of trust and respect to the reader by not explaining everything outright. The more covert or indirect the allusion, the higher the appraisal of the reader by the author. This appraisal contributes to the building or strengthening of the bond between author and reader. "It is this experience of rapport with an author, and not merely the pleasure of having solved a puzzle or 'gotten' a joke, that makes the effort required of a reader to activate an obscure allusion worthwhile" (21).

There is one more item regarding the author we must note before moving to the third component of allusion. When we speak of authorial intent, we do not mean that we can enter authors' minds through their writing and fully determine their mental and emotional deliberations and thought processes. We do have the verbal artifact of their text(s), which does communicate their assessment(s) of their subject(s), but with only text, we cannot know beyond what a text provides.[60] Rather, we agree with Cherney's assessment of authorial intention, namely that "readers intuitively consider themselves receivers in a communication event; furthermore, they intuit the existence of a sender(s), the sharing of meaning with whom they see as the purpose of the event—and readers also consider it possible to fail" (2014:22).

### 2.2.4.3 – The Reader (Audience)

The third component of a literary allusion is the reader. The reader (and, some scholars would clarify, the intended audience) is a responsible party in the co-production of an allusion's meaning.[61] As such, the reader has an active role in the interpretation of an allusion.[62] Scholars have understood this active role in different ways. Ben-Porat famously outlines four stages through which a reader proceeds during recognition and interpretation of allusion. The reader (1) recognizes a marker in the alluding text, (2) identifies the evoked text because of the marker in the alluding

---

[59] Cf. Perri's discussion of energy expended to understand a joke relative to the amount of enjoyment in the outcome (1978:301-303).

[60] Cf. Nielsen: "However, despite the difficulty of determining the author's intention, we cannot give up operating with an author and his intention. What we know about the 'author' is only the tracks and markers that are laid down in the text to help the reader associate to specific intertexts" (2000:18).

[61] See Lester's comments noted above (2015:7-8). Kelly also concludes, "Literary allusions are not primarily formal features within the text that involve a hermeneutically active and intentional author combined with a hermeneutically passive and receptive reader. The primary characteristic of the figure of allusion is the way in which it functions by virtue of two fields of signification, and this characteristic requires attention to the hermeneutical intentionalities of both authors and readers" (2017:37-38).

[62] Perri puts a strong emphasis on the reader's role: "In allusion… the referent, whether expressed overtly or covertly (but always recognizably) is present in the text and *the audience must recover* its attribute(s), the tacit aspect of allusion" (1978:299, emphasis added).

text, (3) modifies the interpretation of the alluding text based on the additional information from the evoked text, and optionally (though frequently) (4) activates the whole context of the evoked text to reinterpret the alluding text (1976:110-111). Perri explains allusion by adapting "rules" of speech act theory to the particularities of allusion. Many of them focus on the text and the author, but Perri acknowledges that the author and audience must implement the rules together. She then enumerates "[t]he perlocutionary effect" on the audience:

1) The audience *comprehends* the literal, un-allusive significance of the allusion-marker.
2) The audience *recognizes* the allusion-marker to be an echo of a past source text (or of a preceding part of the alluding text itself).
3) The audience does not fully understand the alluding text upon recognition of source text and *realizes* that construal is required.
4) The audience *remembers* aspects of the source text's intension [sic].
5) The audience *connects* one or more of these aspects with the alluding text to complete the allusion-marker's meaning (1978:301, emphasis original).

Pucci goes even further, declaring "the reader is the crucial component in the best function of allusion" (1998:28). He does not embrace the idea of co-production of meaning. However, he elevates the role of the reader "at the expense of the author," perhaps inspired by his appreciation of poststructuralism (x, 45 n. 27). Pucci seems to speak out of both sides of his mouth though in that he says the reader alone creates an allusion's meaning(s) (for the text only creates the *potential* for an allusion's meaning), and yet an allusion's meaning(s) must be considered in all the surrounding, author-controlled, non-allusive context even if that allusive meaning does not match what the author intended (36-48).[63] We appreciate Pucci's emphasis on the reader and agree with his assertion that

[63] For Pucci, an allusion's language can only create the potential for meaning; it is up to the reader to create and interpret meaning. Readers are required to activate an allusion. With as much power and liberty as Pucci affords the reader, he does insist the author has a role. A specific intended meaning by the author can be posited but not demonstrated convincingly (1998:41). This positing is possible because "[o]utside of the allusion… the author reasserts interpretive control. There is a strong logic calling for such a view, for clearly there must be some semblance of solid ground, some stable point, from which interpretation proceeds" (45). In this view, the author has control before the allusion. At the point of the allusion, the author yields control to the reader who then creates and interprets meaning and then "speaks" that meaning in the author's voice so the interpretation can blend with the reprise's context. When the allusion is done being actualized and spoken as though by the author, the reader yields and returns control to the author who proceeds in controlling the interpretation in the subsequent non-allusive text. "This does not mean that the author intends the meaning arrived at when an allusion is read, only that he is made to say them—or that they are said for him" (46). Nielsen also sees meaning potential in an author's writing and claims those potentialities are only realized by the reader(s) but differs from Pucci by indicating meaning is finished by the reader rather than solely created (2000:18).

an allusion is activated by the reader (understood as different from solitary meaning creation), but find his overall argument lacking.[64]

Authors invite readers into the allusion's interpretation, so readers are not left to their own devices (Cherney, 2014:21; cf. van Wolde, 1989:47). Relevance theory offers some limitations to the possible meanings a reader co-produces with the author. Building upon Ben-Porat's assertion that there is a "tacit agreement" between author and reader, Cherney writes:

> Relevance theory maintains with Grice that a normal reader is always constrained and guided by his/her goal: a plausible reconstruction of the author's intentions that advances the purpose of the communication event. Therefore, a relevance-theoretic approach to allusion will evaluate how a source reader… could reasonably be expected to have ascertained those intentions using the clues that the allusion provides (2014:21-22).[65]

The active role of the reader does not guarantee that the reader's interpretation of an allusion will match the intention of the author but does presume a certain competency by the reader to participate in the co-production of meaning.[66] There is any number of possible explanations a reader might not interpret an allusion as the author intends.[67] Scholars note that one of the main reasons the reader can (co-)produce meaning in allusion is because of a shared "common knowledge" with the author, be it a shared literary, historical, or cultural tradition (Perri, 1978:296, 300; Alter, 1989:112-113; Edenburg, 1998:69; Machacek, 2007:526; Cherney, 2014:4). The historical moment and surrounding culture of the reader also impact a reader's interpretation of allusion (Machacek, 2007:531-535).[68]

Thus, we see, even with the terminological issues surrounding the discussion of allusion, literary allusion consists of interaction and partnership in the production of meaning between author

---

[64] It is telling that few scholars have engaged with Pucci here. Pucci does not appear in the bibliography for Machacek's article on allusion (2007), even though Pucci's work is the subject reviewed in Machacek (2001). Also, Pucci disagrees at multiple points with structuralism's emphasis on the author and text (to the detriment of the reader in his view) but does not interact with Ben-Porat's or Perri's assertions (noted above) that the reader has an important role to play in the understanding of allusion.

[65] Cf. Pattemore (2002:51) and Grice (1975). Contra Machacek who sees "a nearly limitless burgeoning of potential meanings in allusion" for the reader and "interpretive communities and traditions" (2001:292-293).

[66] See Edenburg (2010) for a discussion of literary versus oral/aural competency in the audience. Edenburg argues that certain types of textual connections indicate those connections were intended for literary, not oral/aural, audiences. Cf. Lubeck (2001:73, 83).

[67] See Alter (1989:121); Schultz (1999:206-207, 236-237); Hutton (2007:277); and Machacek (2007:526-527).

[68] Baden cautions against modern readers presuming that modern interests match those of ancient audiences: "References, citations, and allusions are used by the scholar to grasp the history of the literature. But we scholars are not the audience for the biblical authors. No biblical author wrote in order that his readers should be able to trace the Bible's literary history, nor is knowledge of that literary history a necessary precondition for understanding any biblical writings" (2017:128).

and reader(s) through one text referencing another text or other texts. We acknowledge many different nuances in the plethora of definitions made available by scholarship thus far. However, for the sake of establishing a definition for this study, we repeat here the definition offered by Cherney because it displays an awareness of important aspects of each of the critical components noted above:

> A segment of a literary text may be said to contain an "allusion" when it uses language similar to language found in a prior text such that, by calling the prior text to mind, an implied reader arrives at a significantly altered understanding of the new text, a significantly altered attitude toward its author, and a plausible reconstruction of its author's intentions, all of which advances the purpose of the communicative event (2014:22).[69]

### 2.2.5 – For Inner-Biblical Allusion

We have examined the terminology utilized in biblical studies for investigating textual connections. We have seen that the term 'intertextuality' has some basic associated understandings but ultimately is an immensely flexible term. We also explored the term 'allusion' and its key components. We now evaluate briefly why the present study uses the term '(inner-biblical) allusion' rather than 'intertextuality'.

We argue for the use of 'allusion' because allusion is less ambiguous and thus more accurate than other terms for what this study investigates.[70] The inherent assumption of authorial intentionality that comes with allusion argues for its use in studies such as this one (Alter, 1989:112; Sommer, 1998:9; Miller, 2011:305; Carr, 2012:531; Levinson, 2014:28; Gibson, 2016:30-32).[71] Even those who argue for a critically important role for the reader and the reader's immense interpretive freedom in allusion acknowledge the role the author and the author's intention play in allusion (Pucci, 1998; Machacek, 2007). Meek argues that a study labeled 'intertextuality' and includes a diachronic element is labeled inaccurately and thus unethically so (2014:282, 291). We do not go so far as Meek to call such a label "unethical", but we do encourage a thorough terminological clarification if 'intertextuality' is chosen as the operative term for a biblical study of textual connections that includes aspects of diachrony or authorial intent.

---

[69] Many thanks to Prof. Christo Van der Merwe for making this study aware of Cherney's work on allusion.

[70] Cf. Brettler: "My approach, which focuses on allusion, is from the author's perspective, and I urge all who discuss intertextuality to make clear what approach they are taking, or like Sommer, whom I follow, to avoid that term in favor of less ambiguous terms such as 'allusion'" (2017:79).

[71] The very nature of allusion implies diachrony and an author with intention; we see this with Ben-Porat's discussion of *alluding* and *evoked* texts. Thus, 'allusion' is the more accurate term for our purposes, since 'intertextuality' can be taken to mean, and include, so many things.

Since our corpus is comprised of two sections of biblical text and the term ‘allusion’ affords a greater accuracy for the nature of our inquiry, we speak of inner-biblical allusion throughout the remainder of the study.

## 2.3 – Process for Identifying and Analyzing Allusions

We have established the critical components of allusion and explained why our preferred term for the remainder of the study is ‘inner-biblical allusion’, but we have not yet reviewed how we identify and analyze the allusions to Exodus we find in 2 Chr 10-36. In this section, we discuss the process we repeat with each allusion discovered in the study.

The field of biblical studies does not (yet?) have a fixed set of criteria for detecting and interpreting inner-biblical allusions, though certain elements are regarded more and more as vital to the task. In his 2011 survey of the previous twenty years, “Intertextuality in Old Testament Research,” Miller mentions a handful of scholars who have offered methodological steps for studying HB/OT inner-biblical connections. Miller ultimately comments on a “lack of discussion” in the field, perhaps because of the heated nature of the scholarly debate and the resultant timidity (291).

We provide a select survey here of scholars whose methodologies have impacted the field. As noted above, Fishbane’s work in 1985 provides a catalyst to the study of HB/OT inner-biblical connections but does not offer a user-friendly framework for scholars to follow.[72] In 1989, Hays offers an important list of seven ‘tests’ to determine the presence of an allusion/echo. Though he focuses on Paul’s use of the HB/OT, Hays’s influence on HB/OT biblical studies is clear; Lester, in his survey of inner-biblical interpretation, calls Hays’s work “enormously influential” (2013:451). Kynes, whose method provides the framework for the present study, acknowledges he is “particularly indebted” to Hays and points to individual HB/OT scholars who likewise base their method on that of Hays (Kynes, 2012:29, 29 n. 78).[73] Sommer’s 1998 study builds upon Hays’s method, adding an eighth test regarding literary similarity which results from common usage or

---

[72] See 2.2.2 above.

[73] Hays’s influence can also be seen in studies such as Evans (2006); Lester (2015); Gibson (2016); and Carr (2017). One can see aspects of Hays’s seven tests within Kynes’s framework listed in 2.3.1. The seven tests are as follows:

1) Availability. Was the proposed source of the echo available to the author and/or original readers? ... 2) Volume. The volume of an echo is determined primarily by the degree of explicit repetition of words or syntactical patterns, but other factors may also be relevant ... 3) Recurrence. How often does Paul elsewhere cite or allude to the same scriptural passage? ... 4) Thematic Coherence. How well does the alleged echo fit into the line of argument that Paul is developing? ... 5) Historical Plausibility. Could Paul have intended the alleged meaning effect? ... 6) History of Interpretation. Have other readers, both critical and pre-critical, heard the same echoes? ... 7) Satisfaction. With or without clear confirmation from the other criteria listed here, does the proposed reading make sense? (1989:29-32)

shared cultural traditions (219-220 n. 12). He does not address direction of dependence in his methodology and is critiqued for incorporating too much subjectivity into his allusion identification.[74] Edenburg's 1998 article overviews different types of textual connections and "propose[s] five categories for establishing author devised interrelations" and two ways of evaluating literary dependency and direction (64-74). Similarities between her model and Hays's include the value of certain types of lexical correspondence. Schultz suggests "a new model," supporting diachronic and synchronic elements in allusion identification and interpretation, and, like others, sees "verbal and syntactical correspondence" as vitally important. Ultimately though, Schultz does not propose a specific method, only "a new attitude" regarding the value of combining diachronic and synchronic methods (1999:222-239).[75] Carr's 2001 essay focuses on determining the direction of influence in inner-biblical connections. Leonard's 2008 article emphasizes the importance of shared language and provides the most thorough criteria to date for evaluating shared language; he also provides helpful questions for determining the direction of influence. Lyons's methodology considers direction of influence as well as shared language in evaluating allusions (2009). Lester (2015) and Kelly (2017) draw upon Ben-Porat, Perri, and Conte and emphasize the importance of function in identifying allusion. In HB/OT studies of inner-biblical connections in the last thirty years, shared language, the direction of influence, and an allusion's function are areas seen as vital to a methodological approach. The methodology below integrates the various criteria, questions, and approaches of the noted scholars into Kynes's framework as needed.

Before proceeding, we acknowledge again the inherent difficulty noted in this chapter's introduction: identifying and interpreting allusions is an act that requires judgment and advocacy, not hard-and-fast answers. Sommer wisely exhorts: "Biblical scholars (not a few of whom strive in vain for a scientific sort of precision) need to realize that indisputable assertions regarding the presence of allusion are not the goal of literary study; indeed, this branch of learning relishes that which is subtle and suggestive" (1998:217 n. 1). In a discussion of whether ancient audiences could have comprehended an allusion, Zevit summarizes the issue well, "The difficulty is not in providing a simple 'yes' or 'no' but in creating a strong case in support of the seemingly simple answer, an answer best treated as an assertion requiring justification" (2017:3). So it is for the present study.

We establish a methodological process and criteria for identifying and analyzing allusion to evaluate connections between texts more objectively. Before discussing his criteria for establishing textual connections, Gibson comments in a footnote: "It is best to view these criteria as cumulative

---

[74] Schultz critiques Sommer for relying too heavily on the presence of certain stylistic features for identifying allusions and introducing "a major subjective element into the analysis" (1999:40-41).

[75] Cf. Schultz (2013:191).

steps towards establishing a link between two texts. The degree of probability for an explicit/implicit intentional reuse of an earlier work is directly proportional to the number of criteria that are met" (2016:33 n. 45). We follow the criteria below to establish a standard by which we judge the evidence in this study. We endeavor to proceed with what Carr calls "methodological modesty" (cited in Kelly, 2017:36).

Establishing a methodology brings some objectivity to a subjective enterprise. Sound methodology protects against eisegesis; this is important if our study is to respect the author as a co-producer of meaning.[76] Moving towards established criteria for identifying and evaluating alluding texts and their related evoked texts alleviates some of the confusion inherent in an exercise that yields numerous interpretations.[77] In the absence of set criteria in the field, we advocate for the following methodology.

This study does not offer a new methodology but instead puts forth a methodology comprised of the detailed methodologies enumerated by Kynes (2012); Leonard (2008); and others. Though we do not use his appellation 'intertextualities-in-dialogue' (for reasons noted above), we favor the methodology developed by Kynes to identify and interpret correspondences between texts (2012:17-60). His methodology is the most robust of those surveyed above and provides an interplay between synchronic and diachronic processes. Allusion contains diachrony as one of its base assumptions, but it also beneficial to consider it from a synchronic perspective.[78] This study follows Kynes's model for its methodological framework because it recognizes the value of both approaches and combines their benefits.[79] Kynes summarizes his methodological steps:

> They are best followed in this order, though they inevitably overlap with one another. 1. Identification (synchronic): Where does this text point to another and to which text(s) does it point? 2. Date (diachronic): Which order of texts is historically plausible? 3. Coherence (synchronic): Which order makes better sense of the internal and external context? 4. Use (diachronic): How is the author using the allusion? 5. Recurrence (synchronic): What other allusions connect the two texts? 6. Holistic interpretation (diachronic): How do allusions to the precursor contribute to the meaning of the alluding text as a whole? 7. Reciprocation (synchronic): How does the use of the precursor affect

[76] Put creatively, Zevit asks, "When contemporary scholars discover what they refer to as allusions and echoes, are they revealing illusions or delusions of the eye? Is a scholarly article illustrating the presence (or absence) of historical, intellectual, and literary connections between alleged parallels an eisegetical essay about Rorshach inkblots or an exegetical narrative about actual literary links?" (2017:5).

[77] Cf. Gibson (2016:21-22).

[78] As discussed above in 2.2.3 and 2.2.4.

[79] See 2.2.3 above.

> our understanding of it? 8. Historical implications (diachronic): What do these allusions say about the standing of the earlier text at this time and the interpretive techniques at play (2012:59)?

### 2.3.1 – (Marker) Identification[80]

This methodological process begins with the synchronic identification of connection(s) between two or more texts. The primary criterion under consideration in this step is shared language, but this step is not limited to shared language. In his survey, Miller states firmly, "All can agree that lexical resemblances constitute the best criterion by which to measure proposed intertextual relationships…" (2011:303-304). Indeed, many scholars in biblical studies studying allusion acknowledge the importance of shared language as a primary criterion (295). Even Kelly, who would presumably take issue with Miller's contention that shared language is the "best" criterion, acknowledges its usefulness as an indicator of allusion (2017:27-38).[81]

Kynes's first step discusses specifics of evaluating shared language (such as lexical, syntactical, and stylistic similarities) but could be developed further. Leonard's eight principles regarding the assessment of shared language strengthen the approach here:

> (1) Shared language is the single most important factor in establishing a textual connection. (2) Shared language is more important than nonshared language. (3) Shared language that is rare or distinctive suggests a stronger connection than does language that is widely used. (4) Shared phrases suggest a stronger connection than do individual shared terms. (5) The accumulation of shared language suggests a stronger connection than does a single shared term or phrase. (6) Shared language in similar contexts suggests a stronger connection than does shared language alone. (7) Shared language need not be accompanied by shared ideology to establish a connection. (8) Shared language need not be accompanied by shared form to establish a connection (2008:246).[82]

Leonard explains these principles in greater detail, using examples from his test case of Ps 78 (246-257). Elements from other scholars' earlier methodologies can be seen in Leonard's principles.[83]

---

[80] We add "(Marker)" to Kynes's label to clarify that the identification spoken of here corresponds to Ben-Porat's first and second stages (1976:110) and Perri's first two effects on the reader (1978:301), not to the identification of the presence of an allusion itself. For discussion of the reader's cognitive process in recognizing and identifying markers of allusion, see 2.2.4.3 above. Cf. 2.3.4 below.

[81] Kelly argues for function as the confirming criterion for an allusion's presence. See 2.3.4.

[82] Kynes refers to Leonard (2008) in a footnote but does not directly engage with the article.

[83] See especially Fishbane (1985:285, 288; 1998:18, 26); Alter (1989:116-118); Hays (1989:29-32); Sommer (1996a:159; 1998:5, 27-28, 30, 35-57, 72); and Edenburg (1998:65, 72-74), all of whom Leonard references or explicitly quotes.

Leonard's article is widely known and referenced in biblical studies since its publication, receiving both support and critique. By way of example, Gibson interacts heavily with Leonard, reinforcing Leonard's principles regarding unique language (#3), shared phrases (#4), the accumulation of shared language (#5), and the importance of shared context (#6) (2016:34-37). Kelly supports Leonard's principle of accumulated shared language (#5) but says Leonard goes too far regarding the significance of non-shared language (#2) (2017:36-37). Kelly's argument does not deter our use of the principle, but we recognize that this principle should be employed cautiously.[84] Kelly also urges caution regarding two other principles. Quoting Edenburg, Kelly reminds the modern interpreter that what appears as unique or common language in the HB/OT may not have been unique or common to ancient authors or audiences; we only know the language of these authors and audiences through a limited and closed corpus. Thus, one should exercise caution in employing Leonard's third principle (35-36).[85] Kelly's last critique of Leonard relates to the seventh principle. Kelly grants that shared ideology is not necessary to determine an allusion but wonders why Leonard does not proceed further and ask how ideological matters could factor into determining an allusion's presence. This critique is connected to Kelly's bigger concern in his essay that biblical studies do not see a potential allusion's rhetorical function as a determining factor of an allusion's presence (as literary theory seems to indicate) but as a later exegetical step (30). We address this concern in 2.3.4.

With the above principles for identification in view, we turn to other matters related to shared language. A minimum word count of shared lexemes is not necessary to indicate an allusion's presence but does provide a practical threshold for a study. Allusions can undoubtedly exist without lexical matches (whether using synonyms or themes), and any established threshold is ultimately "arbitrary" (Schultz, 1999:223).[86] However, in Chapter 3, we only examine allusions with some sort

---

[84] Kelly argues contra Leonard that non-shared language should not be precluded from potentially dismissing the presence of allusion, citing Choi's argument from Ps 78 and Exodus that an absent element may indicate lack of allusion. However, earlier in Kelly's article, Kelly notes the omission in Jon 4:2 of a term from Exod 34:6; both texts have several shared terms much like Leonard's and Choi's example from Ps 78 and Exodus. Kelly argues that Jon 4:2 would not be more allusive if the missing term were included, nor would the removal of other terms make Jon 4:2 less allusive (2017:31-32). In that instance, it appears Kelly himself argues that a non-shared element in a potentially alluding context does not impact an indication of an allusion's presence, thus countering the argument he presents later when quoting Choi.

[85] Leonard himself urges a certain amount of caution regarding unique and common language in a later article (2017:96, 99).

[86] See also Pucci (1998:32); Gibson (2016:34, 40-41); and Kelly (2017:31-32). One example from 2 Chr 10-36 of a potential allusion without lexical match is found in 2 Chr 31:7. Both Japhet (1993:965) and Klein (2012:450) note a connection to Exod 23:16 (Klein also references Exod 34:22), but there are zero lexical matches between 2 Chr 31:7 and Exod 23:16 (and Exod 34:22). Similarly, Hobson sees many connections between the biblical portrayal of Sennacherib and the book of Exodus, but the lexical matches are in 2 Kings and Isaiah rather than Chronicles (cf. Schreiner [2018] for connections to 2 Kings). Hobson does note conceptual connections between Chronicles and Exodus (2013:204-211).

of verifiable lexical commonality: at least one lexical match, if not in form, certainly with shared lexeme.[87] Shared language by itself does not *confirm* the presence of an allusion, but without shared language, the difficulty of arguing for an allusion's presence increases significantly.[88] There may be examples within our corpus of allusions without shared lexemes, but those theoretical examples are harder to support and not addressed in the present study.[89]

Shared language is a critical criterion in identifying allusion, but shared language does not necessarily indicate the presence of allusion. The shared language could be accounted for by other means. Kelly differentiates between referential and non-referential shared language. He writes and summarizes Noble (2002), "It is important for those interested in literary allusion to recognize non-referential shared language and distinguish it from referentially significant occurrences of shared language. Noble listed three non-referential alternatives to explain the presence of shared language -- coincidence, independent traditions, and a third, distinct source" (2017:34).[90] Kelly also cites Sommer (1998:32-35) and Choi (2010:29-30) in supporting this word of caution. Kynes concurs, noting that formulaic language, common word-pairs, and words that naturally belong together may constitute non-referential language. Kynes then enumerates four additional cases in which shared language does not indicate an allusion's presence: (1) shared language "with no evidence of reworking on the part of one author"; (2) a common formula without additional indications such as recurrence (see 2.3.5); (3) a stronger connection to a different passage; and (4) "equal connection in multiple passages" (2012:38-42).

---

[87] Here we align for practical reasons, but do not necessarily agree in theory, with Gibson, who argues contra Stead (2009:33-34, 37) that a "word/root *must* be the same but not necessarily appear in the same grammatical form (lemma) or genre" (Gibson, 2016:34 n. 49, emphasis added). Gibson asserts that if we grant Stead's argument that a link can exist between texts through cognates or synonyms, "the element of subjectivity significantly increases, and raises the question why the original author did not use the same word/root if he wanted the reader to be directed to a particular source text or theme. By using a different word/root he has immediately put the reader off the intertextual scent" (2016:34). Gibson's point here makes for a more objective methodology. Thus, we follow it for the purposes of the present study, even though we appreciate Stead's theory. Similarly, Kynes supports the theory that "[a]llusions may be signaled through situational or thematic similarities instead of direct verbal borrowing," but still adopts a minimum count of shared words for pragmatic purposes (2012:37). In support of Stead's contention, see also Alter (1989:122).

[88] Literary theory claims the presence of allusion is *confirmed* by the presence of functional reuse of the evoked text and is discussed below in 2.3.4.

[89] See below for a discussion of allusive indicators aside from shared language. Lester argues for the possibility of allusion without shared language but with shared conceptual markers. His theoretical argument is sound but is weakened due to the shared language in his example texts (2015:68, especially 68 n. 25). Moving away from shared language into only shared concepts moves the argument further away from objectively verifiable data.

[90] Cf. Kwon (2017) who attributes similarities between Job and Deutero-Isaiah to a certain "common scribal mindset in the Persian period" rather than literary dependence determined by relative dating and literary parallels (32-34, 46).

In addition to shared language, other markers may indicate the presence of an allusion. DiFransico argues well that a "distinctive metaphor" may indicate allusion (2015; cf. 2017).[91] Sound-play (or paronomasia) may also indicate allusion (Kline, 2016; cf. Sommer, 1998:69). The structure and/or patterns of one text may indicate a relationship to other texts (Leonard, 2016:122-123; cf. Sommer, 1998:67, 71; Berman, 2007). Inverted quotations (Beentjes, 1982), expectation reversal and/or characterization (Berger, 2009b), and a text's literary structure (Berger, 2010; 2011; Leonard, 2017) can assist one's argument for the presence of an allusion.[92] With shared language and other markers providing an initial awareness of a potential allusion's presence, we now address how to establish dating and direction of dependence for those texts in our study.

### 2.3.2 – Date

The next step is diachronic and attempts to determine the (probable) dates of writing for each of the texts tentatively connected in the first step. If dates can be roughly determined or relative dating of each text to the other(s) can be determined, this step allows an initial assessment of which text came first and was potentially available to the other(s). Such an assessment leads us closer to determining the direction of dependence.[93] Though dating precisely the writing of texts in the HB/OT is rather difficult, possible date ranges can be ascertained for many of its books. Depending on the texts in question, one can argue for the relative dating between specific texts. The development of texts and the development of Hebrew within the canon could help date texts' composition, but such studies often prove inconclusive (Kynes, 2012:49).[94]

As noted in 1.3.3, the dating of the composition of 2 Chronicles and Exodus cannot be located in any precise year. Nevertheless, most scholars date Chronicles in the fourth century BCE, making the (proto-) Pentateuch and (proto-) Exodus available to the Chronicler, however one dates the Pentateuch (see 1.3.3.1). Additionally, the internal evidence in 2 Chr 10-36 of the existence of the scroll of the law (or "of Moses" or "of the covenant") possibly indicates the availability of (proto-) Exodus to the Chronicler.[95] These initial arguments do not prove that the Chronicler had Exodus at his disposal, but certainly inclines one studying potential connections between these biblical books

---

[91] In her abstract, DiFransico summarizes her argument this way: "The analysis of a metaphor that is rare or unusual within the Hebrew Bible has the potential to inform the identification and exploration of inner-biblical connections and can aid in the discussion of dependency and directionality" (2015:542).

[92] Lyons notes the significance of many of the markers listed here as well (2009:88-109).

[93] Kynes acknowledges the similarity of this step to Hays's first test, "Availability" (2012:49 n. 153). Cf. Hays (2008:34) and Carr (2017:42).

[94] Cf. Emanuel (2013), who employs linguistic evidence in a "complementary role" to literary evidence as his "primary point of departure" for the relative dating of his examined texts (82).

[95] 2 Chr 17:9; 25:4; 34:14, 15, 16, 18, 21, 24, 30, 31; 35:12.

to see 2 Chronicles as the alluding text. The following step can add weight to the argument for an allusion's direction.

### 2.3.3 – Coherence

The third step is again synchronic and attempts to argue which text alludes to the other(s) from the relationship of the texts in question.[96] Indeed, if a determination was made in the second step regarding the texts' dating, that information will influence one's determination of which text is alluding and which is evoked. However, Coherence attempts to determine the direction of dependence irrespective of any potential dating established in the second step.[97] This step, combined with the second, is vital to the study of allusion. Without these two steps for evaluating an allusion, "there is an unfortunate semantic loss" and "little can be said with regard to its purpose" (Schultz, 1999:225, 230; cf. Gibson, 2016:43). Determining allusive direction is difficult and ultimately subjective, so conclusions of this step are, as with evaluating allusion overall, a matter of advocation rather than proof (Schultz, 1999:58-59; 2013:191).

The internal and external evaluations of Kynes more or less encompass the variety of methodologies for this step offered within the last twenty-five years.[98]

> The coherence of the parallel texts is evaluated, first, internally, in their immediate context, and then externally, in relation to the context of the parallel text. When comparing internal coherence, the text in which the possible allusion fits more awkwardly is more likely the later text, based on the assumption that words and images fit better in their original settings than in new contexts to which they are later adapted… The comparison of external coherence builds on the assumption that allusions carry with them their surrounding contexts, since authors allude to texts and not merely words (2012:52).

Kynes provides an example from a different scholar for his internal method but admits it proves inconclusive (52). Carr provides better examples of how an internal coherence investigation would

---

[96] Kynes summarizes the step and its synchronic nature: "…the possibility of an allusion is evaluated in both texts simultaneously in the hope that a simultaneous comparison will shed light on the sequence of the texts. Though the result hoped for from this comparison is diachronic, the method of comparing the possible meaning of the allusion in both directions involves imagining at least one relationship between the texts that could not have historically existed, since both texts cannot be dependent on each other in a single parallel, so this step is best considered synchronic" (2012:52).

[97] Besides 'direction of dependence', this step is also known in scholarly writings as 'direction of influence' or 'directionality'.

[98] E.g., Edenburg (1998); Carr (2001; 2017); Leonard (2008); Lyons (2009); Tooman (2011); and Gibson (2016). Kynes acknowledges the similarity between this step of his framework and that of the "Thematic Coherence" test from Hays (1989).

yield useful results (2001:110-111).[99] Kynes does provide a helpful example for his external method with the connection between Ps 8:5 and Job 7:17-18. If we suppose Job 7 alludes to Ps 8, then it is a case of a frustrated character parodying praise of God. If Ps 8 is understood to allude to Job 7, then we see a praise song turning the questions of a frustrated character into a positive statement about God's work. While both are possible understandings of the connection, only the former option fits more naturally with each passage's context. So Kynes determines the direction of the connection; Job 7 is the alluding text, and Ps 8 is the evoked text (2012:53; cf. 69). If a case arises in which neither direction of influence seems more plausible, Kynes suggests that the text with a greater proclivity for allusion be considered the alluding text (53-54). The brief consideration in this step of the linguistic nature of each text itself and how each text might use the other(s) provides a transition to the following step.

### 2.3.4 – Use

This diachronic step takes the information gained from its predecessors to evaluate more deeply how the author of the later text uses the earlier one(s) in an allusion, if at all. The previous statement is qualified with "if at all" because if two or more texts are noted to have shared language or other markers *potentially* indicating the presence of an allusion, and the second and third steps indicate the *possibility* of a direction of dependence, we still have not yet successfully argued for the presence of an allusion. "Not every reference to an older text will be an allusion…" (Lester, 2015:6). For some, this step of Use is when the investigative process shifts from allusion identification to exegesis. Kelly says biblical studies tend to emphasize form more than function and illustrates his point by interacting with Leonard's 2008 article on methodology (2017:27-30).[100] Indeed, such studies focus on shared language (and similar concepts like "shared content" and "formal resemblances") and direction of dependence to identify and determine the presence of an allusion with only the briefest consideration of rhetorical function, if at all (Miller, 2011:294-298; see also, e.g., Edenburg, 1998:71-74; Lyons, 2009:47-75; Tooman, 2011:27-35).[101] Not all HB/OT inner-biblical studies can be categorized this way (e.g., Lester [2015:4-9] includes "rhetorical function" in his definition and identification of allusion), but Kelly's argument remains valid.

Kelly (2017:27-29) and Lester (2015:4-9) bring literary theory into the identification of inner-biblical allusions, and both argue for biblical studies to interact more with the literary theory of

---

[99] Carr's survey of "criteria for relative lateness" includes more much specific statements about the language utilized in the texts and its functional use than Kynes's brief discussion of internal coherence. Carr's specific criteria could be used to bolster Kynes's internal investigation.

[100] Kelly's argument would be stronger if he named and/or interacted with studies beyond Leonard's.

[101] Lyons's methodological section entitled "Criteria for Determining Purposeful Use" relates to the use of shared language and stylistic features of the proposed alluding text rather than the rhetorical function of that language.

Ben-Porat, Perri, and others.[102] Such theory indicates that an allusion is not properly identified and understood as allusion until its rhetorical function is evaluated and the reader observes some modification of the evoked text by the alluding text. Kelly, speaking of Ben-Porat's four stages, writes: "Successful identification of an allusion, however, turns on the third stage: readers must modify their understanding of the marker based on their interpretation of the marked in the evoked text. Only once an allusive function of the marker is detected can readers claim to have identified an allusion" (2017:29).[103] Kynes does not engage with literary theory in this step, nor does he seem to address specifically the sequential process in which the reader identifies an allusion (though his first step's label may confuse matters).[104] If at all, Kynes indicates obliquely in his first step that function plays a role in identification when he argues shared language "with no evidence of reworking on the part of one author" may disqualify the presence of an allusion (2012:38). Kynes does engage literary theory in his sixth step.[105]

We now consider the assessment of function. An author may use an earlier text in any number of ways. Kynes acknowledges and points to lists elsewhere of nearly limitless possibilities (2012:54). We discuss potential uses for allusion above in 2.2.4.2.[106] Kynes offers a helpful list of questions one may ask in this step: "How has the author changed the precursor? Are the similarities or the differences between the passages emphasized? What attitude is the author taking toward the precursor? And, to how much of the precursor's context is the allusion referring?" (54; cf. Alter, 1989:129). Assuming a rhetorical function is observed in the later text, the subtlety or overtness of the allusion or its relative size in the alluding text does not determine its significance to the alluding text. Indeed, there is no formula for determining what function an allusion plays in the alluding text, nor how significant to the alluding text as a whole that function is.[107] If the rhetorical use of the potential allusion is not discovered, it may be that the shared language or other markers are what scholars label an 'echo' and the study of that textual connection as allusion may cease (Sommer, 1998:15-17, 30-31; cf. Kelly, 2017:29).

---

[102] Kelly especially emphasizes the importance of the double-signification of texts in allusion as expounded by Ben-Porat (1976:109-116) and Perri (1978:295).

[103] Cf. Schultz (1999:221, 227) and Barker (2018:702-703).

[104] Kynes speaks of connections between Job and various Psalms as allusions throughout his methodology because he argues (convincingly) later in the book that they are, in fact, allusions. His writing style is such that his writing and arguments appear atemporal rather than sequential.

[105] See 2.3.6 below.

[106] See n. 54 earlier in this chapter.

[107] Alter suggests the reader's best guide to determining the extent and significance of the allusion is common sense (Alter, 1989:124, 129). We agree with Alter but qualify his suggestion with relevance's theory assessment of the reader interacting with the plausible indications in the text that the author has provided. See 2.2.4.3 above.

### 2.3.5 – Recurrence

This step returns to a synchronic, text-based focus. Here we investigate if the author alludes to the evoked text(s) or other aspects of the evoked text(s) anywhere else in the alluding text, either before or after the allusion.[108] It could be that an allusion is localized and insignificant to the overall narrative, and it may appear only in that one instance. Conversely, once an allusion is made, authors tend to continue to allude to that text (or those texts) or develop the allusion later in their text (Kynes, 2012:55). There is the possibility that one allusion could be a key component to the alluding text, and that significance could produce multiple similar allusions or variations (Alter, 1989:118, 127-128). This step attempts to discover if the allusion in question could be connected to other allusions by the author.

One can easily observe the similarities between this step and Step 1 and may prescribe their combination. Nevertheless, Kynes keeps them separate and explains his reasoning: "The search here is, like the first step, mainly a synchronic comparison of the two texts searching for similarities that may be allusions. However, because the texts have already been linked and the direction of dependence already established, additional allusions need not be quite as strong as the initial connection, and the direction may be assumed" (2012:55; cf. 37-38). Kynes also affirms the cumulative nature of arguments for allusion while acknowledging the potential issue of developing a circular argument (55).[109] Lastly, we note the importance of recurrence for differentiating between actual allusions and appeals to common sources, stronger connections to a different passage, and equal connections to multiple passages (cf. 2.3.1 and Kynes, 2012:39-42).

### 2.3.6 – Holistic Interpretation

"The significance of these recurring allusions is addressed in the sixth step, which is like the fourth except that it now approaches the author's diachronic use of the earlier text holistically instead of focusing on one particularly marked allusion" (Kynes, 2012:55). As Kynes states, this step expands the work of the fourth and looks for how the possible recurrence of similar allusions might shape our understanding of the alluding text more fully. We may see more because of how a repeated allusion or variations on an allusion reveal other details in the alluding and evoked texts. In the case of repeated allusion and/or variations, "the allusion is a key to the work not merely through strategic placement…, but through being a recurrent thread in the formal design of the work and thus part of the imaginative definition of character, theme, and world" (Alter, 1989:127). It is in this

---

[108] See also Hays's test, "Recurrence" (1989:30). Cf. Sommer (1998:71-72) and Stead (2009:253).

[109] For the cumulative nature of the argument, see also Sommer (1998:35) and Berger (2009a:254-255). Kynes notes Schultz's caution that using cumulative arguments may still not be stronger than a single convincing argument and adds, "if the case for each individual allusion is dependent on the recognition of them all, the argument is circular, thus this criterion cannot stand on its own" (2012:55 n. 191; cf. Schultz, 1999:70-71).

step that Kynes cites Ben-Porat's definition of allusion, associating allusion's simultaneous activation with the alluding and evoked texts' entire contexts (2012:55-56). He is certainly right to make the association, but with Kelly and Lester, we understand the simultaneous activation of texts beginning with the fourth step, not just the sixth.

### 2.3.7 – Reciprocation

This step looks back to the evoked text(s) to see if our understanding of it(them) is altered by the later text's allusion(s). Presumably, a diachronic relationship between the texts is established at this point. However, the essence of this step is synchronic, "which emphasizes the reader's ability to compare the texts and see new features of the earlier text through the connections with the later one" (Kynes, 2012:58). The meaning of the evoked text(s) does not change, but rather, the reader may see aspects which were previously unnoticed (58 n. 208; Sommer, 1998:18).[110] This reciprocation is not a primary feature of allusion and may not occur in all allusions, but it can be a benefit to the reader nonetheless (Sommer, 1998:18).[111]

### 2.3.8 – Historical Implications

The eighth step considers what the examined allusion(s) communicates about the standing of the evoked text(s) standing when the alluding text was written and what interpretive techniques were employed at the time. Since this step concerns historical reflections, it is understood as diachronic. Those alluding texts with undeterminable dates may not benefit from this step much (Kynes, 2012:58-59). Regarding the present study, this step may yield information about the interpretive habits of post-exilic authors and the post-exilic community's regard for the text of their ancestors' deliverance from the hand of an opposing empire.[112]

## 2.4 – Implications for Exegesis

The process discussed in 2.3 provides the methodological steps for our evaluation of inner-biblical allusions in Chapter 3. In Chapter 4, we examine and synthesize the results of Chapter 3, looking for trends, patterns, and themes in the allusions to Exodus. Chapter 5 takes the findings of Chapter 4 and compares them to the overall rhetorical argument(s) and theme(s) present in Chronicles to see how the Chronicler incorporates allusions to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36 into his rhetorical strategy. How does one determine the rhetorical argument(s) and theme(s) present in a

---

[110] Cf. Barton (2007:86), who distinguishes between the meaning and the significance(s) of a text.

[111] Cf. Schultz (1999:207) and Moyise (2002:424).

[112] Cf. Ben Zvi (2011:34), who argues "that Chronicles is an excellent source for reconstructing modes of reading authoritative texts and reconstructing the range of operative meanings that this authority may have signified for the late Persian or early Hellenistic literati centered around Jerusalem."

narrative text? This section outlines the exegetical method this study employs to answer that question.

This study primarily follows the exegetical framework presented by Lubeck in his 2001 dissertation entitled, "Swallowing Jonah: Strategies for Reading Biblical Narratives." His approach to the author, text, and reader aligns closely to the one presented above in 2.2.4. Lubeck advocates for "an authorially-oriented approach" that is "cognizant of the legitimate claims of text-centered and reception-centered approaches" (46-47). He argues convincingly that the author of a narrative uses the text's adherence to literary conventions for the narrative genre to guide the competent reader as that reader interprets the text.[113] The reader may understand a meaning different from the author's intention, but that does not change that a text's approach to literary conventions has the potential to indicate to a reader the author's intended meaning (73). Since the author's communication is intentional, we agree that "the act of reading and interpreting a narrative rests upon the assumption that every piece of the narrative within the context is significant" (111; cf. 109-110).

Three "essential elements" of narrative are setting, plot, and characterization (25, 50, 106).[114] A text presents a narrative world with its setting(s), invites the reader to that narrative world, and "steers the reader to adopt an intended, normative stance toward it" (72). A text's setting(s) relates to both space and time (74-75).[115] A setting's space can mean more than a physical location; it also "refers to the mental associations that people make with particular places" (74). A setting's time is not just the forward temporal movement of a narrative, but the pace at which the narrative moves as well as specific techniques (such as flashbacks or alternating sequences) that the narrator uses to indicate the flexibility of time in the narrative world (74-75). The "time of narration", the time external to the story, "meaning the time it takes to tell the story", impacts the reader's sense of pace (Amit, 2001:104). The author uses "narrated time", the time internal to the story, to depict specific periods of the characters' lives and shape the story's sequence of events in accordance with "the author's purpose and rhetoric" (104). "This obliges the author to manipulate the narrated time with great skill, because a brief story may cover a period of many years" (105).

---

[113] See Lubeck (2001:17, 45, 48-58) for a definition and discussion of literary conventions for narrative.

[114] Some literary critics understandably add "style" as a fourth element (Lubeck, 2001:25). Due to its breadth and importance as a topic, Lubeck defers to his discussion of style in a previous work and only briefly incorporates style here under his consideration of plot (120-123, 130-132). This study does likewise.

[115] Components of space include: Backdrop, Historical credibility, Type-scene, Revelatory of character, Unique context, Opponent, Angle, and Movement (Lubeck, 2001:77-80). Components of time include: Pace, Gapping, Summary, Progress, Freeze, Flashback, Foreshadowing, Alternation, and Repetition (81-86).

Understanding the author's use of narrated time is essential in analyzing biblical writings because important themes are highlighted when narrated time is extended (108). Conversely, recognizing how and when the narrative is compressed empowers the reader to see more readily the other places in the narrative when the author has extended narrated time. Biblical authors compress narrated time when they seek to progress the story (quickly) to points of emphasis. This is certainly true for the writing of the Chronicler, especially in 1 Chr 1-9. Speaking of biblical authors, Amit writes,

> Anyone who sets out to tackle such a long period, a matter of thousands of years, must be very conscious of the need to pass over some periods, or reduce them to a minimum time of narration, and must develop a technique of compression: how to cover in a short time of narration a very long period in the narrated time (105-106).

Amit then discusses specific techniques of compression that biblical authors use: lists, standard phrases, and summarizing statements (106-108). We see these techniques in Chronicles (see 5.2.1.2, 5.2.2.2, and 5.2.3.2).

Lubeck defines plot as "the arrangement of events and actions within a narrative so as to highlight the temporal and causal relationships between them. Plot serves as the means by which the episodes are related to meaning" (2001:109). Multiple variables influence the reader's understanding of the plot, including Plot movement, Opponents, Plot type, Stock forms, and Style (112-123).[116] The characters' actions are borne out through a narrative's plot and thus can reveal the author's characterization.[117]

Characterization "describe[s] the means employed by the author in fashioning or influencing one's perceptions in their portrayal of each figure in the story" (157). This step considers the following about the characters: depth of exposure (whether they are round or flat characters), dynamism (whether the characters develop or are static), the mode of characterization (direct or indirect),[118] roles (protagonist, antagonist, foil, satirical), and whether the reader identifies with the

---

[116] Components of Plot movement include: Opening, Incitement, Escalation, Peak, Resolution, and Ending (Lubeck, 2001:112-114, 124). Opponents (in biblical narrative) include: God(s) or spirits, (An)other person, Society, Nature and circumstances, and Self (114-115, 124-125). Plot type is traditionally understood as tragedy or comedy (115-116, 125-129). "Identifying 'stock forms' of narrative plotting is an endeavor fraught with difficulties" (116); consequently, Lubeck offers a suggestive, and not comprehensive, list with biblical narratives in mind: Journey, Test, Conquest, Romance, Rebirth or healing, Conversion, Retribution, and Vindication (116-120, 129). Components of an author's style as they relate to plot include: Suspense, Irony, Satire, Humor, Gapping, and Parallels (120-123, 130-132).

[117] Lubeck defines a 'character' as "a personality, created by an author, in which consistent traits are combined together such that distinctive individuality emerges through the implied choices of that person or being" (2001:157).

[118] Lubeck writes of a spectrum for evaluating the mode of characterization, running from left to right, uncertainty through inferred information to certainty through stated information (2001:160). The spectrum in order is

characters.[119] "If *setting* dictates the when and the where of the narrative, and *characterisation* the who, *plot* communicates the what and the why" (109; italics original).

As a supplement to Lubeck's brief consideration of Style in his dissertation, we also evaluate the point(s) of view or perspective(s) used in 1-2 Chronicles. Gary Yamasaki provides an extensive methodological approach to point-of-view analysis in biblical studies. He labels the discipline "Perspective Criticism" and identifies the branch of study as a sub-discipline of Narrative Criticism (2016:34-35). Yamasaki highlights and adopts the framework of literary critic Boris Uspensky (as others before him have done; e.g., Berlin, 1983:55-57) to evaluate a narrative's point of view on five functional planes: temporal, spatial, psychological, phraseological, and ideological (2006:91-93; 2016:35, 37-44).[120] Yamasaki also incorporates the work of Meir Steinberg to analyze narratives on a sixth plane, that is, informational (2016:39, 41-42). Perspective Criticism provides tools for the reader to not only evaluate a text's (and its author's) style in the use of point of view but to understand the "interpretive implications" of the literary technique (34, 36-39, here 38).

Building upon the textual investigations of Use and Holistic Interpretation in Chapter 3, the setting, plot, characterization, and perspective of 1-2 Chronicles will be evaluated in Chapter 5 to determine the rhetorical argument(s) and theme(s) present in the text. This allows for a comparison between these rhetorical argument(s) and theme(s) and the trends, patterns, and themes in the Chronicler's allusions to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36.

---

below:

| Character's actions | Character's speech | Other characters' speech | Characters' inner life | Narrator's description | Narrator's evaluation | God's evaluation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

[119] Depth of Exposure refers to how many traits and complexities a character possesses; a round character has more, a flat character has fewer (Lubeck, 2001:157-159). Dynamism signifies whether a character is developing, static, or ambivalent in the narrative (159). Mode refers to whether the narrator informs the reader about a character through direct or indirect information (160-161). Lubeck notes: "…generally speaking biblical narratives tend toward indirect over direct information; that is, they prefer to show rather than for the narrator to state an overt judgment. Also, it is reasonable to infer that characters who are blessed by YHWH are most likely being implicitly affirmed by the narrator as a positive example" (209). Roles in characterization include protagonist, antagonist, foil, and satiric portrait. Identification asks if a character is sympathetic ("one with whom readers identify, approve of, admire, and appreciate"), antipathetic ("one designed for the audience to reject, oppose, and even to hold in contempt"), or vacillating somewhere between. A "weak" character does not yield much identification, if at all (163-165). The qualities evaluated in characterization's Depth of Exposure, Dynamism, and Identification are best understood as existing on respective spectrums rather than as impermeable categories.

[120] With two of the planes being temporal and spatial, the analysis of setting and perspective overlap. Additionally, the discussion of Angle within the realm of setting can overlap with the psychological plane. See 5.2 and 5.5 below.

## 2.5 – Conclusion

In the first half of this chapter, we evaluated terminology relevant to the present study by examining the term ‘intertextuality’, briefly surveyed the study of HB/OT inner-biblical connections in the last thirty-five years, and dispelled the false dichotomies of historical/literary and synchronic/diachronic approaches to texts. We also reviewed literary theory related to the term ‘allusion’. The three critical components of an allusion are the text(s), the author, and the reader. The latter two work together in the co-production of an allusion’s meaning as the text provides indications to the reader of the author’s intent. We argued for the use of ‘inner-biblical allusion’ as the most accurate term for our purposes.

In the second half of this chapter, we discussed methodology as it relates to the examination of inner-biblical allusions and a narrative’s rhetorical argument(s) and theme(s). The study of allusion and narrative arguments is a subjective enterprise, so a methodology mitigates some of the subjectivity. Regarding allusions, the methodology discussed above provides some objectivity through a repeatable process. The field of biblical studies has not developed a standard methodology for the investigation of inner-biblical allusions, so we adapted an eight-step methodological framework from the work of Kynes, Leonard, and others, incorporating both synchronic and diachronic elements to gain the benefit of both approaches to evaluating textual connections. Regarding narratives, the methodologies offered by Lubeck, Yamasaki, and others applied in this study examine a narrative’s setting, plot, characterization, and perspective to understand the author’s rhetorical argument(s) and textual theme(s).

In the following chapter, we will apply the above eight-step process to the Hebrew text of 2 Chr 10-36 to see where, how, and for what purpose(s) its author alludes to the book of Exodus.

# Chapter 3 – Inner-Biblical Allusions to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36

## 3.1 – Introduction

This study seeks to answer the following principal questions: Where, how, and for what purpose(s) does the Chronicler reference the book of Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36? How does the Chronicler's use of Exodus impact his rhetorical argument(s) in that part of the narrative? Chapter 2 addressed underlying methodological issues related to these principal questions, namely: how one identifies (1) references in 2 Chr 10-36 to Exodus and the nature of those references, (2) the author's purpose in making those references, and (3) the Chronicler's rhetorical argument(s) in our specified text. This chapter addresses the first principal question above: Where, how, and for what purpose(s) does the Chronicler reference the book of Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36? Chapter 4 will review the author's purpose(s) for allusions to Exodus and categorize them, noting any patterns or themes. Chapter 5 will address the second principal question above. The goal of this chapter is to identify the Chronicler's allusions in 2 Chr 10-36 to the book of Exodus, assess the nature of those allusions, and evaluate the rhetorical argument(s) motivating the allusions. The study of each allusion proceeds through the methodological steps outlined above in Chapter 2.[1]

The process by which the allusions in 3.2 were identified began with the translation of the Hebrew text of Exodus into English, followed by the translation of the Hebrew text of 1-2 Chronicles into English.[2] This translation process resulted in this study's initial identification of the majority of the allusions in 3.2. Additional allusions were later identified through the systematic review of shared Hebrew terms between Exodus and 2 Chr 10-36.[3] Concurrent with the examination of the texts' shared terminology, a few allusions were also identified through the consideration of biblical scholarship on Chronicles. While this study cannot claim an exhaustive listing of *every* allusion in 2 Chr 10-36 to the book of Exodus, we do state that a thorough investigation of the relevant texts has been undertaken from multiple angles.

---

[1] See 2.3. Step 2 (Date) is considered in 3.1.1 for all but one of the allusions below rather than in the investigation of each allusion individually to avoid unnecessary repetition.

[2] Though not in this study's focus on 2 Chr 10-36, the translation of 1 Chronicles was beneficial for Chapter 5's evaluation of the main idea(s) and theme(s) present in the text of Chronicles as a whole. Any English translations in this study are original unless otherwise noted.

[3] Using software (Bibleworks 10), lists of the Hebrew words used in Exodus and 2 Chr 10-36 were compiled and collated. Those terms not appearing in both texts were removed, resulting in 568 shared terms. The edited list was then arranged in ascending order by frequency of use within the HB/OT. Shared terms up to a frequency of 200 HB/OT uses (336 terms total) were then investigated for allusive use between the texts. Frequencies higher than 100 occurrences in the HB/OT resulted in fewer and fewer terms of interest, so a frequency of 200 occurrences in the HB/OT was chosen as the research cutoff for the sake of practicality.

### 3.1.1 – Dating

As noted in 2.3.2 above, it can be difficult to date biblical texts to a specific year, and some biblical texts cannot be dated at all. However, some texts can be dated to general time ranges, and so those texts can be dated relative to other texts. Such is the case with the books of Exodus and Chronicles. As discussed above, most scholars maintain that (proto-) Exodus was available to the Chronicler.[4] This claim cannot, of course, be proven beyond question, but we are likewise convinced that Exodus pre-dates Chronicles and was available for use in the latter. Internal evidence also suggests a (proto-) pentateuchal source was available to the Chronicler. Thus, for each allusion considered below except one, the study proceeds from Step 1 to Step 3;[5] we understand, based on relative dating, that Exodus is the evoked text and 2 Chronicles the alluding text. Since this study only focuses on the uses of Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36, there is no need to repeat the same argument each time the study cycles through its methodology.

### 3.1.2 – False Positives

In the process noted above in 3.1, many lexical matches were discovered that ultimately did not meet our criteria for allusion once we proceeded to Steps 3 (Coherence) and 4 (Use) for examining those matches. To demonstrate the effectiveness of the methodology, we mention in this section some of the different types of these "false positives" before turning to the allusions themselves.

#### 3.1.2.1 – Rare Lexical Matches

Two or more texts sharing rare words or phrases can indicate the presence of a potential allusion but does not necessarily require that a text be alluding elsewhere. The examples in this subsection illustrate the argument made above in 2.3.4 that one's methodology for identifying and analyzing allusions must include an evaluation of the potential allusion's rhetorical function.

Two phrases in 2 Chr 10-36 provide examples for this point. The phrase תְּקוּפַת הַשָּׁנָה ('the turn of the year') only appears in Exod 34:22 and 2 Chr 24:23 in the HB/OT. The first word of the phrase, תְּקוּפַת, itself only appears four times in the HB/OT (Exod 34:22; 1 Sam 1:20; Ps 19:7(6);[6]

---

[4] We also understand the books of (proto-) Numbers and (proto-) Deuteronomy as available sources for the Chronicler (cf. Klein, 2006:38; Schweitzer, 2011:54; Japhet, 1993:16). Where those books contain a co-evoked text in Numbers or Deuteronomy with an Exodus text (see 3.2.8, 3.2.9, 3.2.14, and 3.2.15), we proceed from Step 1 to Step 3 in the relevant allusion's assessment as well.

[5] In 3.2.12, Step 2 (Date) is detailed because the dating of the book of Nehemiah is relevant for that discussion.

[6] In this study, when the Hebrew and English numberings differ, the Hebrew numbering is listed first, followed by the English in parentheses. If the numbering differs, but there is only one verse number listed, that verse number is the Hebrew numbering.

2 Chr 24:23). Leonard's third and fourth principles state that rare or distinctive language shows a stronger connection than common words and that shared phrases show a stronger connection than individual terms (2008:246). With these principles in mind, this phrase in 2 Chr 24:23 seems full of potential to be identified as an allusion to Exod 34. However, upon considering this potential allusion's Coherence and Use, the argument for allusion breaks down. In Exod 34, the phrase is used in a command concerning feasts and the time each year to celebrate those feasts. In 2 Chr 24, the phrase is used in a narrative to explain when an army attacked King Joash; it appears closer in structure and form to punctiliar temporal phrases in other military texts rather than the ongoing annual command in Exod 34:22.[7] Aside from their shared phrase, there does not appear to be any connection between these Exodus and 2 Chronicles texts. One struggles to see how either the author of Exodus could have used the 2 Chronicles text or how the Chronicler could have used this Exodus text.

Similarly, the phrase וַאֲנַחְנוּ לֹא נֵדַע ('and we ourselves do not know') only appears in Exod 10:26 and 2 Chr 20:12. Though it uses more common terms than the previous example, this phrase also seems at first glance that it could be an allusion due to its exclusive use in only two passages. However, when one considers the phrase's Coherence, it also falls short. The Exod 10 use comes from the mouth of Moses as he is attempting to convince Pharaoh to release the people of Israel along with their livestock since they did not know what they would need to serve their God. The use in 2 Chr 20 is found in Jehoshaphat's prayer to God for the deliverance of Israel from their enemies; they did not know what to do but were looking to God for help. In terms of external Coherence, it makes little sense for the author of Exodus to use part of Jehoshaphat's prayer to convince Pharaoh, nor does it make sense for the Chronicler to refer to Moses' attempted persuasion of Pharaoh in a prayer to God for deliverance.

### 3.1.2.2 – Appeal to General Concept

Another type of false positive encountered is a known phrase from another text being used to appeal to a general concept rather than a specific allusion to the literary content and context from that source text. In 2 Chr 12:1, the Chronicler tells of when King Rehoboam and Israel 'forsook the law of YHWH' (עָזַב אֶת־תּוֹרַת יְהוָה). The phrase 'law of YHWH' appears in the HB/OT nineteen

[7] Note the phrase's use as a temporal marker at the beginning of 2 Chr 24:23, וַיְהִי לִתְקוּפַת הַשָּׁנָה. Klein says this phrase "suggests that this [attack] happened in the spring, when the rainy season was over and armies could move more easily" and notes similar phrases in 2 Sam 11:1 (// 1 Chr 20:1) and 1 Kgs 20:26 (2012:347).

times;[8] in HB/OT canonical order,[9] the phrase is first seen in Exod 13:9 when Moses tells the people of the Feast of Unleavened Bread. Initially, one may consider the use of the phrase in 2 Chr 12:1 as a possible allusion to this Exodus usage, but an examination of the contexts of, and uses in, Exod 13 and 2 Chr 12 indicate that the reference in 2 Chronicles is an appeal to the collective laws of YHWH rather than the specific commands regarding a feast given in Exod 13. The phrase 'law of YHWH' is repeatedly used by the Chronicler, appearing eight times in his narrative.[10] The other uses in Chronicles display a general and wide-reaching understanding of the phrase rather than referring to a specific instance of one (type of) regulation.

It may also be that 2 Chr 12:1 is connected to Jer 9:12(13). In Jer 9:12(13), YHWH explains the reason for his coming judgment against his people; they have forsaken his law (וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה עַל־עָזְבָם אֶת־תּוֹרָתִי). In 2 Chr 12:1, the Chronicler explains the unfaithfulness that brings about the attack from the king of Egypt (12:2). These two passages are the only ones in the HB/OT where YHWH's תּוֹרָה is preceded with the direct object marker and is the object of the verb עזב ('to forsake/abandon').[11] Further study of these passages in connection to each other could be worthwhile.

A second example of this type of false positive is related to the first. Second Chronicles 14:3(4) tells of Asa saying to Judah to seek YHWH, the God of their fathers, and to do the law and the commandment (וְלַעֲשׂוֹת הַתּוֹרָה וְהַמִּצְוָה). The phrase מִצְוָה + הַ + וְ + תּוֹרָה + הַ is found only in Exod 24:12; 2 Kgs 17:37; and 2 Chr 14:3(4). The terms תּוֹרָה and מִצְוָה appear together in twenty-two verses across the HB/OT,[12] but this particular construction is only found the three noted times. Rather than an appeal to the specific literary context of Exod 24, it appears the Chronicler understands the phrase as a "collective singular", signifying "the entire scope of God's precepts" (Japhet, 1993:707). Perhaps the Chronicler is connecting Asa's commands in 2 Chr 14:3(4) to the

---

[8] Exod 13:9; 2 Kgs 10:31; 1 Chr 16:40; 22:12; 2 Chr 12:1; 17:9; 31:3, 4; 34:14; 35:26; Ezra 7:10; Neh 9:3; Ps 1:2; 19:8; 119:1; Isa 5:24; 30:9; Jer 8:8; Amos 2:4.

[9] Regarding "canonical order", see 1.3.2.

[10] 1 Chr 16:40; 22:12; 2 Chr 12:1; 17:9; 31:3, 4; 34:14; 35:26.

[11] Psalm 89:31(30) and 119:53 both have תּוֹרָה as the object of עזב, but they are not marked with the direct object marker. Psalm 89:31(30) mentions 'my law' with Israel's God speaking, but the immediate context does not identify that it is specifically YHWH speaking. Psalm 119:53 mentions 'your law'; the verse preceding Ps 119:53 indicates the person of address is YHWH.

[12] Gen 26:5; Exod 16:28; 24:12; Deut 30:10; Josh 22:5; 1 Kgs 2:3; 2 Kgs 17:13, 34, 37; 2 Chr 14:3(4); 19:10; 31:21; Ezra 10:3; Neh 9:13, 14, 29, 34; 10:30(29); Prov 3:1; 6:20, 23; 7:2.

command of YHWH in 2 Kgs 17:37 since that passage also includes the infinitive construction לַעֲשׂוֹת as the verb tied to the object clause in question (though the infinitive construction appears later in 2 Kgs 17:37 rather than immediately preceding the object as it does in 2 Chr 14:3[4]).[13] Further study is required.

### 3.1.2.3 – Stronger Sources Elsewhere

There were multiple instances during this study's research when a potential allusion to Exodus was examined but then discovered to be a potential allusion to a passage outside Exodus. The Exodus passages and the other passages had shared language with the alluding text in 2 Chr 10-36, but the other texts had *more* shared language and/or a more robust contextual similarity.[14] This weakens the argument for an allusion to Exodus and strengthens the argument for an allusion elsewhere. Two examples will suffice to illustrate the point.

The first example is relatively straightforward but worth discussing because of how frequently one encounters such a case. Second Chronicles 31:12-14 mentions different types of offerings brought to the temple by those in Jerusalem because of Hezekiah's command in 31:4. The people bring 'contributions, tithes, and consecrated things' (הַתְּרוּמָה וְהַמַּעֲשֵׂר וְהַקֳּדָשִׁים), as well as 'freewill offerings' (נְדָבוֹת). This context of bringing offerings to the dwelling place of God, along with some of its terminology, may remind one of Exod 36:3-6.[15] However, while this Exodus passage contains similarities to 2 Chr 31, there are other passages with a stronger contextual connection and more lexical overlap.[16] Numbers 18; Neh 10; and Ezek 45 each contain three of the four above terms in 2 Chr 31:12-14.[17] Of these options, Num 18 may have the strongest connection as the gifts enumerated there are meant for the priests (Num 18:8ff.), and the portions commanded

---

[13] It is also possible that 2 Kgs 17:37 could be alluding to Exod 24:12 since both share covenant making contexts.

[14] Cf. 2.3.1 and Kynes's third factor that may argue against allusion (2012:40).

[15] This Exodus passage mentions the תְּרוּמָה and נְדָבָה, but not the מַעֲשֵׂר nor the קֹדֶשׁ (in its plural noun form).

[16] Cf. Leonard's fifth and sixth principles: "(5) The accumulation of shared language suggests a stronger connection than does a single shared term or phrase. (6) Shared language in similar contexts suggests a stronger connection than does shared language alone" (2008:248).

[17] Numbers 18 uses תְּרוּמָה eight times (18:8, 11, 19, 24, 26, 27, 28 [x2], 29); מַעֲשֵׂר six times (18:21, 24, 26 [x3], 28); and קֹדֶשׁ six times (in its plural noun form, 18:8, 9 [x2], 10, 19, 32). Nehemiah 10 uses תְּרוּמָה twice (10:38, 40); מַעֲשֵׂר three times (10:38, 39 [x2]); and קֹדֶשׁ once (in its plural noun form, 10:34). Ezekiel 45 uses תְּרוּמָה six times (45:1, 6, 7 [x2], 13, 16); מַעֲשֵׂר twice (45:11, 14); and קֹדֶשׁ once (in its plural noun form, 45:3).

by Hezekiah in 2 Chr 31:4 are meant for the priests and Levites.[18] Deuteronomy 12 could also be an allusive source because of lexical and contextual reasons. That passage contains all four of the above terms.[19] The bringing of goods to the temple in 2 Chr 31 is prefaced by a cleansing of the land from pillars, Asherim, high places, and altars (31:1). Likewise, the list of various things to be brought to the place YHWH chooses in Deut 12 is prefaced by a command to cleanse the land from worship sites on high mountains and hills, altars, pillars, and Asherim (12:2-3). Whichever pentateuchal text 2 Chr 31:10-14 is alluding to (or perhaps both; further study is required), Exod 36 is not one of the strongest contenders.

The second example of this type of false positive is not as obvious. Second Chronicles 33:3-9 elaborates on how King Manasseh did what was wicked in the eyes of YHWH (33:2).[20] There are a few terms in this elaboration that direct the reader to think of other texts. In 2 Chr 33:3, Manasseh "bowed down (וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ) to all the host of the heavens (לְכָל־צְבָא הַשָּׁמַיִם), and he served them (וַיַּעֲבֹד אֹתָם)". The phrase "all the host of the heavens" is repeated in 33:5. Then in 33:7, Manasseh put "the image of the idol (פֶּסֶל הַסֶּמֶל) that he made (עָשָׂה)" in the temple. Providing additional evidence that the Chronicler has a pentateuchal text in mind, God speaks in 33:8 of obedience to "all that [he] commanded them (צִוִּיתִים) [Israel's fathers] according to all the law (לְכָל־הַתּוֹרָה), and the statutes (וְהַחֻקִּים), and the judgments (וְהַמִּשְׁפָּטִים) by the hand of Moses". Exodus 20:4-5 may come to mind since this portion of the Ten Commandments states one shall not make (עשׂה) an image (פֶּסֶל) or likeness of anything in the heavens (שָׁמַיִם) and forbids bowing down to (חוה) or

[18] Cf. Klein (2012:452) and Japhet (1993:967-969).

[19] Deuteronomy 12 uses תְּרוּמָה three times (12:6, 11, 17); מַעֲשֵׂר three times (12:6, 11, 17); קֹדֶשׁ once (in its plural noun form, 12:26); and נְדָבוֹת twice (12:6, 17).

[20] The Chronicler has used 2 Kgs 21 as his source, as can be seen by comparing the texts of 2 Kgs 21:1-9 and 2 Chr 33:1-9. However, there are differences in the latter indicating either reworking (additions, omissions, or spelling changes) by the Chronicler or a different *Vorlage* from the final form of 2 Kgs 21 we have now. We agree with Japhet (1993:1000-1004) and Klein (2012:473-477) who see the textual differences as reworking.

serving (עבד) the things one has made.[21] On the other hand, the text of Deut 5:8-9 is virtually identical to Exod 20:4-5, with only the smallest of minor differences.[22]

In such a case where the possible evoked texts are so close, we turn to the surrounding contexts to evaluate the arguments' strength. Lexically, there is perhaps a slightly stronger argument for a Deut 5 connection to 2 Chr 33:3-7 since both 2 Chr 33:8 and Deut 5:1 mention Moses telling Israel to be careful to do (שׁמר + לְ + עשׂה) God's statutes (חֹק) and judgments (מִשְׁפָּט).[23] Scholars also observe multiple connections to Deuteronomy in the first part of 2 Chr 33. Klein (2012:478) and Japhet (1993:1005) note a relationship between 2 Chr 33:2 and Deut 18:9, 12. Discussing 2 Chr 33:4, Klein says, "The quotation of YHWH seems to derive from Deut 12:4–5" (2012:479). Japhet states that 2 Chr 33:6 "is a clear reflection of Deut. 18:10" (1993:1006). As just noted, there is a high lexical overlap between 2 Chr 33:8 and Deut 5:1 (and/or Deut 12:1). These connections surrounding 2 Chr 33:3, 7 strengthen the argument that the Chronicler had Deuteronomy in mind.[24] One last option for an evoked text behind 2 Chr 33:3, 7 is Deut 4:13-19, where Moses recalls the giving of the Ten Commandments. The lexical connections here are even more substantial. 'To command' (צוה) appears in both Deut 4:13 and 4:14; v. 14 also contains God's statutes (חֹק) and judgments (מִשְׁפָּט). Deuteronomy 4:16 warns against acting corruptly by making (עשׂה) an image (פֶּסֶל) in the likeness of any figure (סֶמֶל). Deuteronomy 4:19 cautions against being led astray by "all the host of the heavens" (כֹּל צְבָא הַשָּׁמַיִם) and bowing down (וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוִיתָ) and serving them (וַעֲבַדְתָּם). The argument for a connection between 2 Chr 33:3, 7 and Exod 20:4-5 is strong, but the argument for a connection between 2 Chr 33:3, 7 to Deut 4 or 5 is stronger.

---

[21] Japhet does not write of lexical connections between 2 Chr 33:7 and Exod 20:4-5, but of a conceptual one related to God's self-declaration as a jealous God in Exod 20:5 (1993:1006).

[22] Exodus 20:4 has the initial *waw* on וְכָל־תְּמוּנָה which Deut 5:8 lacks. Deuteronomy 5:9 has the *holem* written fully in אָבוֹת while Exod 20:5 has a defective *holem*, אָבֹת. Deuteronomy 5:9 also has the initial waw on וְעַל־שִׁלֵּשִׁים which Exod 20:5 lacks.

[23] Of note, Deut 12:1 likewise has multiple lexical connections with 2 Chr 33:8.

[24] Certainly, an author's repeated allusions in a short span of text to one biblical book does not preclude the use of an allusion to another biblical book. However, repeated allusions to one book incline the reader to first see additional allusions as continued references to that repeatedly used source.

### 3.1.2.4 – Reference to Intermediate Source

In the course of the research, multiple instances of potential allusions were discovered that directed the reader to an intermediate text that itself alluded to Exodus rather than the Chronicles text alluding to Exodus directly. This type of false positive is especially pertinent for this study since so much of Chronicles is based on, and often directly taken from, Samuel and Kings.[25]

This aspect of the Chronicler's text requires an extra step in analyzing potential allusions in Chronicles. When assessing lexical connections in Chronicles to biblical texts other than Samuel or Kings, one must consider whether the source text(s) in Samuel/Kings contain(s) a similar connection to that same potentially evoked text (in our case, Exodus). If there is no parallel in Samuel/Kings to a text in Chronicles, or if the Samuel/Kings parallel does not contain an allusion to Exodus, then we may proceed unhindered to examining the lexical connection between Chronicles and Exodus. If, however, we examine the relevant Samuel/Kings parallel and discover there an allusion to Exodus, we must stop to evaluate the nature of that allusion versus the potential alluding text in Chronicles. If the Chronicles passage shows little or no reworking from Samuel/Kings (particularly in usage), then the thought that the Chronicler is independently alluding to Exodus becomes significantly harder to argue in that case. Rather, the Chronicler would appear to be following his source without taking ownership of the allusion. If, on the other hand, the Chronicles text in question shows either a significant reworking of the parallel text or a change in the usage of that allusion, then one can argue more persuasively that the Chronicler has crafted an allusion to Exodus.

We discuss a few examples to illustrate. Two verses in 2 Chronicles discuss making (עשׂה) calves (עֵגֶל) as an idol: 11:15 and 13:8. If just in concept alone, the making of calf idols for worship reminds an HB/OT reader of Israel's sin at Mount Sinai in Exod 32. With these terms, a lexical connection can be established to Exod 32:4, 8, 20, 35.[26] However, further consideration of other terms, along with the literary contexts in 2 Chr 11:15 and 13:8, pushes the reader to see stronger references to 1 Kgs 12:28-32. For 2 Chr 11:15, perhaps it is evident that the reference would be to 1 Kgs 12 rather than Exod 32 because the Chronicler specifically discusses there Jeroboam and his appointment of his own priests and building on high places (cf. 1 Kgs 12:31); this gives the greater lexical overlap to 1 Kgs 12. Second Chronicles 13:8 does share a further lexical connection to Exod

---

[25] Cf. Childs (1979:645); Braun (1986:xxiii); Noth (1987:52); Japhet (1997:8); Klein (2006:30); Duke (2009:25).

[26] Equally, a lexical connection could be made with these terms to other passages as well. Besides the noted 2 Chronicles and Exodus references, these terms both appear in Deut 9:16, 21; 1 Kgs 12:28, 32; 2 Kgs 17:16; Neh 9:18; Ps 106:19; Hos 8:6; 13:2. While 'calf' is not the direct object of the noted verb 'make' in the Hosea references, the context of each strongly implies the connection between the terms.

32 in that both 2 Chr 13:8 and Exod 32:24 contain the terms ‘gold’ (זָהָב) and ‘calf’ (עֵגֶל).[27]

However, those words appear in different clauses in Exod 32:24, while they appear as a phrase in 1 Kgs 12:28, just as they do in 2 Chr 13:8.[28] Following Leonard’s fourth principle (2008:248), we understand a phrasal connection to be stronger than the individual terms themselves. That the Chronicler is referencing 1 Kings is not surprising given his consistent use of that source.

At this point, we might understand these false positives to be of the previous type, a stronger source other than Exodus. However, what is of interest here, and what sets these examples apart from the last category, is that 1 Kgs 12:28-32 itself contains references to Exod 32.[29] We have noted that 1 Kgs 12:28 contains the phrase ‘calves of gold’ (עֶגְלֵי זָהָב), and that alone may convince one of a connection to Exod 32 due to the rarity of those two terms appearing in a verse together. What argues even more strongly for a connection to Exod 32:4, 8 in 1 Kgs 12:28 is Jeroboam’s reported speech, “Behold, your gods, O Israel, who brought you up from the land of Egypt ” ( הִנֵּה אֱלֹהֶיךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר הֶעֱלוּךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם). Both Exod 32:4 and 32:8 speak of making (עשׂה) a calf (עֵגֶל) and then report the people saying, “These (are) your gods, O Israel, who brought you up from the land of Egypt” (אֵלֶּה אֱלֹהֶיךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר הֶעֱלוּךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם). This phraseology only appears in Exod 32:4, 8, and 1 Kgs 12:28 in the HB/OT.[30] In Exod 32:4, the people say this in response to Aaron crafting the calf idol. In Exod 32:7-8, the reader gets an immediate evaluation of the people’s activity as YHWH reports the people’s sinfulness to Moses while he is up on Mount Sinai and includes this statement by the people down below.[31] The author of 1 Kgs 12 narrates Jeroboam’s intentionality in committing this sin (he takes counsel, וַיִּוָּעַץ), the extent of Jeroboam’s sin (he makes two calves while the people in Exod 32 only made one), and then reports from Jeroboam a

---

[27] These two terms both appear in only four verses in the HB/OT: Exod 32:24; 1 Kgs 12:28; 2 Kgs 10:29; 2 Chr 13:8.

[28] The terms ‘calf’ and ‘gold’ appear next to each other in 2 Kgs 10:29 as well, but a discussion of Jeroboam appointing priests does not occur in 2 Kgs 10:29 or its context. Also, the discussion in 2 Kgs 10:29 focuses on King Jehu later in Judah’s history and discusses the sin of Jeroboam as a retrospective. The discussion of Jeroboam in 1 Kgs 12:28 is in the narrative about Jeroboam’s reign itself rather than looking back on him from a later time. This pushes us to see a connection in 2 Chr 13:8 to 1 Kgs 12:28 and its context rather than 2 Kgs 10:29.

[29] Cf. Amar (2017:17); Cogan (2001:358-359, 363); De Vries (1985:162-163); Provan (1995:109-112); Sweeney (2007:176-177); and Aberbach & Smolar (1967:129-130). Aberbach & Smolar argue for parallels between the characters of Aaron in Exod 32 and Jeroboam in 1 Kings.

[30] Cf. Neh 9:18, which clearly recalls these statements but has some lexical differences. Cf. Sweeney (2007:177).

[31] YHWH says in Exod 32:7 that the people have acted corruptly (שׁחת) and in 32:8 that they have turned aside quickly (סור מהר) from the way that he commanded them.

near-exact duplicate of the people's sinful proclamation. These references in 2 Chr 11:15 and 13:8 to an "intermediate" source referring to Exodus does not make the 2 Chronicles texts allusions to Exodus. However, it does explain why a reader might sense some connection to Exodus in these 2 Chronicles passages.

Another example is the strong lexical connection between Exod 24:7; 2 Kgs 23:2; and 2 Chr 34:30. Both קרא + בְּ + אׇזֶן ('to proclaim in the ear') and סֵפֶר הַבְּרִית ('scroll of the covenant') are rare phrases in the HB/OT, occurring seven times and four times respectively.[32] Even rarer is when the phrases appear together. This combination occurs only three times, in Exod 24:7; 2 Kgs 23:2; and 2 Chr 34:30. The latter two texts are virtually identical.[33] The author of Kings appears to be providing a positive moral evaluation of Josiah and comparing the young king to Moses.[34] The Chronicler appears to have kept close to his *Vorlage* here to provide another example in his text of how Josiah is like Moses (see 3.2.14 below); thus, it appears that the allusion in 2 Chr 34:30 does not differ in its purpose from that of the allusion in 2 Kgs 23:2. The allusion in 2 Chr 34:30 does add to the Chronicler's argument in 2 Chr 34. However, because it is difficult to argue that the allusion is somehow original or unique to the Chronicler, this study does not examine it fully.

We mention one final example of a reference to an intermediate source because of its recurrence in 2 Chronicles. Second Chronicles 14:2(3) gives examples of how King Asa did what was good and right in the eyes of YHWH his God (14:1[2]).[35] He took away the foreign altars and high places (וַיָּסַר אֶת־מִזְבְּחוֹת הַנֵּכָר וְהַבָּמוֹת), shattered the pillars (וַיְשַׁבֵּר אֶת־הַמַּצֵּבוֹת), and cut to pieces the Asherim (וַיְגַדַּע אֶת־הָאֲשֵׁרִים). Based on these terms and Asa's command to keep the law and the commandment (14:3[4]), one might reasonably think 14:2(3) is a reference to Exod 34:13.

---

[32] קרא + בְּ + אׇזֶן: Exod 24:7; 2 Kgs 23:2; 2 Chr 34:30; Jer 2:2; 36:15; Ezek 8:18; Ezek 9:1. סֵפֶר הַבְּרִית: Exod 24:7; 2 Kgs 23:2, 21; 2 Chr 34:30.

[33] The only differences are a handful of minor omissions by the Chronicler, two words appearing in reverse order, and the Chronicler substituting the Levites (וְהַלְוִיִּם) in 2 Chr 34:30 for the prophets (וְהַנְּבִיאִים) in 2 Kgs 23:2. Regarding this last difference, see Leuchter (2009); cf. Japhet (1993:1036). The connection to Exod 24:7 is not impacted by these differences.

[34] Hobbs does not mention an Exodus passage specifically but does see Josiah here functioning like Moses and Joshua (1985:332). Cf. Sweeney (2007:446).

[35] See Klein (2012:213) for differences between 2 Chr 14:2-4(3-5) and 1 Kgs 15:12. The Chronicler has significantly expanded on the reporting of Asa's good deeds in Kings.

| Exod 34:13 | 2 Chr 14:2(3) |
|---|---|
| כִּי אֶת־מִזְבְּחֹתָם תִּתֹּצוּן | וַיָּסַר אֶת־מִזְבְּחוֹת הַנֵּכָר וְהַבָּמוֹת |
| וְאֶת־מַצֵּבֹתָם תְּשַׁבֵּרוּן | וְיִשַּׁבֵּר אֶת־הַמַּצֵּבוֹת |
| וְאֶת־אֲשֵׁרָיו תִּכְרֹתוּן | וַיְגַדַּע אֶת־הָאֲשֵׁרִים |

However, as with 2 Chr 11:15 and 13:8 above, there is a different passage with a stronger lexical connection to the Chronicles text in question, which itself also connects to Exodus. Deuteronomy 7:5 shares an additional verb with 2 Chr 14:2(3).[36] The additional shared verb between Exod 34:13 and Deut 7:5 and the shared word order (thus, no longer individual terms but phrases) indicate a connection between those verses as well (cf. Dozeman, 2009:741, 744; Driver, 1902:99; Thompson, 1974:145-146; Woods, 2011:144).

| Exod 34:13 | Deut 7:5 | 2 Chr 14:2(3) |
|---|---|---|
| כִּי אֶת־מִזְבְּחֹתָם תִּתֹּצוּן | מִזְבְּחֹתֵיהֶם תִּתֹּצוּ | וַיָּסַר אֶת־מִזְבְּחוֹת הַנֵּכָר וְהַבָּמוֹת |
| וְאֶת־מַצֵּבֹתָם תְּשַׁבֵּרוּן | וּמַצֵּבֹתָם תְּשַׁבֵּרוּ | וְיִשַּׁבֵּר אֶת־הַמַּצֵּבוֹת |
| וְאֶת־אֲשֵׁרָיו תִּכְרֹתוּן | וַאֲשֵׁירֵהֶם תְּגַדֵּעוּן | וַיְגַדַּע אֶת־הָאֲשֵׁרִים |

A clear connection to Deut 12:28 in 2 Chr 14:1(2) strengthens the argument that the following verse would be referring to the same book as well.[37] Japhet understands the Chronicler in 2 Chr 14:2(3) as "probably following the spirit of the Deuteronomic precept in Deut 7:5" (1993:706). Thus, we see that 2 Chr 14:2(3) refers to Deut 7:5, which refers to Exod 34:13. We find a recurrence of some or

[36] The same shared terms between Deut 7:5 and 2 Chr 14:2(3) are also present in Deut 12:3. However, in Deut 12:3, the object וַאֲשֵׁרֵיהֶם is associated with a different verb, and the verb תְּגַדֵּעוּן is associated with a different object. This indicates the lexical connection is stronger between 2 Chr 14:2(3) and Deut 7:5 than between 2 Chr 14:2(3) and Deut 12:3.

[37] Cf. note 24 above. The phrase "good and right in the eyes of YHWH your/his God" ( הַטּוֹב וְהַיָּשָׁר בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ / אֱלֹהָיו) only appears in Deut 12:28 and 2 Chr 14:1(2). A phrase with the same terms but a different word order appears in Deut 6:18. Klein notes that the Chronicler takes the "evaluation of Asa" from 1 Kgs 15:11 and "adjust[s] it toward" the phraseology from Deuteronomy. Klein does not indicate whether the reference is to Deut 6:18 or 12:28 (2012:213).

all of these terms from 2 Chr 14:2(3), and thus the connection to Deut 7:5, later in 2 Chr 23:17 and 31:1.[38]

We have noted several examples of different types of false positives from the research to demonstrate how the methodology filters out false allusions. We turn now to the allusions to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36.

## 3.2 – Inner-Biblical Allusions

We noted above (1.3.7) that the Chronicler uses various sources throughout his text. In this section, we examine inner-biblical allusions to the book of Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36.

### 3.2.1 – 2 Chr 10:4-16

The division of Israel's kingdom is described in different ways in Kings and Chronicles. These differences begin during the life of Solomon. The author of Kings tells of the coming split in 1 Kgs 11:9-13; YHWH explains to Solomon that the kingdom will break as a direct consequence of Solomon's disobedience and worship of other gods. Conversely, the Chronicler portrays Solomon's reign in primarily positive terms and does not mention this rationale for the coming division. Some have written of the Chronicler's assessment as entirely positive with no negative notions.[39] However, one can still see in the Chronicler's telling subtle comparison to the stipulations in Deut 17:16-17 and how Solomon falls short of the Torah (cf. 5.4.2 below).[40] While Solomon's abandonment of YHWH and the resulting consequences are not overtly described in Chronicles like in 1 Kgs 11, the reader of 2 Chr 1; 9 is still left with an impression of an imperfect king.[41] This impression aligns with how the Chronicler typically portrays the kings in his narrative, as men of mixed moral character.[42] Having narrated Solomon's life and death without the blatant description

---

[38] In 2 Chr 23:17, the verbs נתץ ('to tear down') and שׁבר ('to shatter') are present but associated with different objects, and the object מִזְבֵּחַ ('altar') is present but associated with a different verb. Second Chronicles 31:1 has all the shared terms from 2 Chr 14:2(3) and Deut 7:5 but in a different arrangement. As noted by Kynes, the strength of recurrences' lexical matches need not be as strong (see 2.3.5 above). Second Chronicles 34:4, 7 also share terminology with 2 Chr 14:2(3), but other terms present in 2 Chr 34:4, 7 indicate a connection to a different Exodus passage. See 3.2.14 below.

[39] E.g., Klein (2012:149); Japhet (1993:633); Knoppers (1990:429-430, 436); Jonker (2013a:202-205); Hicks (2001:257-260); Johnstone (1997b:11).

[40] See 2 Chr 1:14-17; 9:13-28, esp. 9:27-28. Note Japhet's observation of the high frequency of the terms 'gold' (13x) and 'silver' (4x) in 2 Chr 9:13-28 (1993:638-639).

[41] See also Myers (1965:66).

[42] Though much of the Chronicler's portrayal of David is resoundingly positive, even King David does not avoid negative assessment in Chronicles. See the account of David's failed movement of the ark in 1 Chr 13 and David's census in 1 Chr 21. Cf. 5.4.2 below and Evans (2013b:66-67).

of Solomon's gross disobedience, the Chronicler turns to Solomon's son Rehoboam and explains how the kingdom came to be divided.

*Marker Identification*. The concept of 'hard labor' (עֲבֹדָה קָשָׁה) appears in six verses in the HB/OT: Exod 1:14; 6:9; Deut 26:6; 1 Kgs 12:4; 2 Chr 10:4; Isa 14:3. The uses in Exodus refer to the oppressive slavery in which Israel worked for Pharaoh and the Egyptians. The use in Deut 26:6 is part of the confessional retrospective Israelites were to recite when they brought their first fruits for an offering; the phrase there refers to the time Israel was under Egyptian slavery. The texts of 1 Kgs 12 and 2 Chr 10 are very similar, and this similarity is discussed below. For now, we note Jeroboam and "all Israel" use this phrase in 1 Kgs 12:4 // 2 Chr 10:4 when asking Rehoboam to lighten the workload they had under Rehoboam's father, Solomon. The phrase in Isa 14:3 is in the context of promises of future restoration from exile and speaks of the suffering in exile under Babylon.

We observe additional, surrounding lexical and conceptual markers between 1 Kgs 12:4 // 2 Chr 10:4 and Exod 1:14; 6:9 and discuss them momentarily. We do not observe additional markers between 1 Kgs 12:4 // 2 Chr 10:4 and Deut 26:6, nor between 1 Kgs 12:4 // 2 Chr 10:4 and Isa 14:3. These additional markers incline us to see potential allusive connections between 1 Kgs 12:4 // 2 Chr 10:4 and Exod 1:14; 6:9. The significance of the parallels between 1 Kgs 12 and 2 Chr 10 is considered after the additional markers are enumerated; we will only examine the additional markers as they relate to 2 Chr 10, though they also appear in 1 Kgs 12.

The additional markers are both lexical and conceptual in nature. The term עֲבֹדָה is used only once in 2 Chr 10 but is used nine times in Exod 1-6, each time referring to the oppression of the Egyptians.[43] The related verb עבד is used six times in Exod 1-6, four of which refer to working under slavery.[44] This verb is also used in 2 Chr 10:4 by Jeroboam and "all Israel" promising to serve Rehoboam if he lightens the work requirements on them. The term most often used in 2 Chr 10 for the labor is עֹל ('yoke'), but that term does not appear in Exod 1-6.[45] However, the verb כבד ('to be/make heavy') accompanying עֹל in 2 Chr 10:10, 14 is used in Exod 5:9 by Pharaoh, speaking

[43] Exod 1:14 (x3); 2:23 (x2); 5:9, 11; 6:6, 9.

[44] Exod 1:13, 14; 5:18; 6:5. The uses in Exod 3:12; 4:23 refer to serving God.

[45] עֹל appears seven times in the chapter: 2 Chr 10:4 (x2), 9, 10, 11 (x2), 14. Perhaps the Chronicler is drawing on the description of Israel's bondage from Lev 26:13. Cf. Hicks (2001:317).

of the harder labor the foremen and taskmasters were to put on the Israelites.[46] Further, 2 Chr 10 twice says (10:15, 16) that King Rehoboam did not listen (לֹא שָׁמַע). We see such a statement about Pharaoh in Exodus eight times related to the king of Egypt (not) releasing the Israelites from their hard labor.[47] We also observe the term מַס (‘forced labor’) in both 2 Chr 10:18 and Exod 1:11. In 2 Chr 10:18, King Rehoboam sends out Hadoram who was over the forced labor (אֲשֶׁר עַל־הַמַּס) to Israel, but the sons of Israel kill him. In Exod 1:9-11, Pharaoh speaks to his people about the supposed danger that the nation of Israel poses to them, and they respond by establishing taskmasters (שָׂרֵי מִסִּים) over Israel.

Conceptually, we see two connections. First, there is a conceptual connection between Rehoboam’s response to Jeroboam’s and “all Israel’s” request for a lessening of the labor (2 Chr 10:14; cf. 10:11) and Pharaoh’s response to Moses and Aaron asking for Pharaoh to send away the people from their slavery (Exod 5:3-9). Rather than grant the requests, both rulers promise to increase the difficulty of the labor. The second connection is how the lack of listening by Pharaoh and Rehoboam happens because of God’s involvement. In multiple places in Exodus, the text says God hardens Pharaoh’s heart; at least twice, this God-driven hardening is directly connected to Pharaoh’s not listening.[48] In Exod 11:9, YHWH says to Moses that Pharaoh will not listen to Moses “so that [YHWH’s] wonders be made many”.[49] In 2 Chr 10:15, Rehoboam does not listen, “for it was a turn of affairs from God so that YHWH would fulfill his word…”.[50]

We now address the presence of these connections in 1 Kgs 12. As stated above in 3.1.2.4, when we see shared language in Chronicles and Exodus, and the shared language exists in the Kings parallel as well, we must ask whether the Chronicler is taking ownership of the allusion himself (using it for his own purposes), or if it seems he is only using the allusive language because the author of Kings did. If the Chronicles passage shows little or no reworking from Samuel/Kings

---

[46] The related adjective כָּבֵד (‘heavy’) also appears in 2 Chr 10:4, 11 but does not appear in Exod 1-6 in connection with labor/slavery. It is used twice in Exod 4:10 in Moses’ self-description of his inability to speak.

[47] Exod 7:4, 13, 16, 22; 8:11(15), 15(19); 9:12; 11:9.

[48] Exod 7:3-4; 9:12. Of interest is Abijah’s characterization of his father Rehoboam in 2 Chr 13:7. Though 2 Chronicles never says that Rehoboam’s heart was hard(ened) like Pharaoh’s, it is ironic that Abijah says his father was “soft of heart” (וּרְחַבְעָם הָיָה נַעַר וְרַךְ־לֵבָב) in 2 Chr 13:7. Perhaps Abijah is responding to a comparison of his father to Pharaoh by trying to say Rehoboam was the opposite of Pharaoh (though still young and weak).

[49] לְמַעַן רְבוֹת מוֹפְתָי. The following verse (Exod 11:10) then says YHWH hardened Pharaoh’s heart.

[50] כִּי־הָיְתָה נִסְבָּה מֵעִם הָאֱלֹהִים לְמַעַן הָקִים יְהוָה אֶת־דְּבָרוֹ.

(particularly in usage), the thought that the Chronicler is independently alluding to Exodus becomes significantly harder to argue. If the Chronicles text in question shows either a significant reworking of the parallel text or a change in the usage of that allusion, one can argue more persuasively that the Chronicler crafted an allusion to Exodus. Below we enumerate the textual similarities and differences between 2 Chr 10 and 1 Kgs 11 and discuss their implications.

As noted above, the text of Kings prefaces Rehoboam's reign with the pending division of the kingdom in 1 Kgs 11. The reader of Kings knows ahead of time that it is coming.[51] However, the Chronicler does not indicate that any actions of Solomon will lead to the kingdom breaking in two. Before we arrive at Rehoboam's involvement in the narratives, we already see different underlying contexts set by the respective authors.

Much of the material in the texts of 2 Chr 10 and 1 Kgs 12 is the same. There are minor differences throughout, though: spelling changes, the majority of the verses in 2 Chr 10 omit one or two words from the text of 1 Kgs 12, and some of the verses in 2 Chr 10 add one or two words not present in the parallel verses of 1 Kgs 12.[52] Related to the present study, we see that the noted markers of potential allusions to Exodus in the Chronicles text are also present in 1 Kings. However, the various changes in 2 Chr 10 are frequent and conspicuous enough to show a reworking of the text by the Chronicler. Knoppers writes: "Although the Chronicler offers a different evaluation of Rehoboam from that of the Deuteronomist (1 Kgs 14:22-24; cf. 2 Chr 12:14), the Chronicler incorporates all the information on Rehoboam's reign from the Deuteronomistic History. Yet, the Chronicler both reinterprets and reworks this received material" (1990:431). Indeed, Cudworth argues "that the Chronicler has made sufficient changes for a coherent story, one that maintains and even intensifies the blame put on Rehoboam in 1 Kings for his actions" (2014:501).[53]

---

[51] See Amar (2017:3-4).

[52] See Appendix A. Cf. McKenzie (1984:86, 89-90, 99-100). Certainly, variations such as spelling differences or different prepositions with the same meaning could be attributed to a textual difference of the particular *Vorlage* the Chronicler was using. Cf. Amar (2017:1-2 n. 2). However, the differences in verbs and certain changes in nouns and pronouns, especially the Chronicler's repeated use of "all Israel" in this text, argue for seeing the differences as intentional reworkings by the Chronicler rather than (solely) a *Vorlage* difference. Cf. Cudworth (2014:501-508).

[53] Contra Amar who understands the Chronicler to portray Rehoboam in a positive light in 2 Chr 10, going so far as saying "the Chronicler characterizes [Rehoboam and Jeroboam] as essentially faultless" and that "Rehoboam is overtly presented as a positive, reasonable king" in 2 Chr 10:1-11:4 (2017:14). Cudworth observes noteworthy details through a close reading of the Hebrew of 2 Chr 10:1-11:4 and provides rational explanations for those details; e.g., the use of "all-Israel", the presence of the verb עזב, and the Chronicler's omission of the verb ראה from 10:16 (2014:501-508). That said, Amar's critique (2017:10 n. 30) of Cudworth is valid; Cudworth does not wrestle with the seemingly positive treatment of Rehoboam in 2 Chr 11:5-23. Cudworth's argument would be stronger if it included interaction with the remainder of 2 Chr 11. However, this valid critique does not mean that Amar's argument is strong. Amar does

Stepping back to look at the overall layout of the Rehoboam narratives in Kings and Chronicles, there are significant structural differences that evidence reworking by the Chronicler:

- the material of 1 Kgs 12:20 about Jeroboam becoming king over the northern tribes of Israel and Judah alone following the house of David is omitted from 2 Chr 10, yet 2 Chr 10:19 matches 1 Kgs 12:19 exactly, and 2 Chr 10:20 is very similar to 1 Kgs 12:21;
- 2 Chr 11:5-12:1 is unique to the Chronicler's narration;
- the content of 1 Kgs 12:25-14:20 is omitted from the Chronicles account;[54]
- the attack from Shishak, the king of Egypt, precedes the summary of Rehoboam's reign in 2 Chr 12 but follows the similar summary in 1 Kgs 14;
- there are many details of Shishak's attack and Rehoboam's subsequent humbling unique to the Chronicler's account (2 Chr 12:3-9a, 12);
- the summaries of Rehoboam's reign in 1 Kgs 14:21 and 2 Chr 12:13 are very similar, yet 1 Kgs 14:22-24 provides a negative summary focused on Judah while the negative summary in 2 Chr 12:14 focuses solely on Rehoboam.[55]

Knoppers observes that the Chronicler keeps "virtually everything" about Rehoboam from Kings while "deleting virtually everything about Jeroboam"; not only that but the Chronicler more than triples the material about Rehoboam (1990:431).[56] These changes support Amar's claim: "The Chronicler's version of the schism and the events that follow (1 Chr 10:1–12:16) is significantly different from its parallel narrative in the *Vorlage* (1 Kgs 12:1–13:34)" (2017:1).

To close the discussion, when we consider the material leading up to Rehoboam's reign, the small and subtle differences between these narratives in their opening chapters, and the major structural differences following the schism, we must ask what accounts for the differences and their significance.[57] Knoppers writes regarding these differences in the Chronicler's Rehoboam narrative:

---

not interact with Cudworth's emphasis on the term "all-Israel" other than to say it is "unconvincing" and that he believes it results from Cudworth's "overlooking" 11:5-23 (10). He does not discuss the merits (or lack thereof) of that point in Cudworth's argument. Regarding his own argumentation, Amar's readings of certain details in 2 Chr 10 contain many assumptions that are not deduced from the text. These include Amar's explanation for Rehoboam's three-day delay, the two-fold repetition of the people's request in Rehoboam's discussion with the young men, and Rehoboam's sending of Hadoram. We could also include Amar's observation that the people's request is "phrased moderately" yet Rehoboam cannot be held responsible for "fail[ing] to choose the obviously preferable option because [he is] deprived of free choice" (12-14). The text does ultimately hold Rehoboam responsible for his actions (2 Chr 12:14). Further discussion of Rehoboam's characterization is found below in 5.4.3 (and Appendix F).

[54] Cf. Knoppers (1990:430, esp. n. 32).

[55] Cf. Klein (2006:35) and Amar (2017:3-6).

[56] See also Klein (2012:153).

[57] Cf. Amar (2017:2, 8-9).

> Given the Chronicler's deletions, selections, and lengthy additions to his *Vorlage*, one becomes aware of the degree to which these selections are recontextualized within a new setting. Such selections in their new context should not simply be assumed to have an identical meaning to their meaning in Kings. The use of certain passages from the Chronicler's *Vorlage* together with his supplements and commentary can create new meanings at variance with the Deuteronomistic History. *The Chronicler's deletions and selections from his* Vorlage *coupled with his own additions and comments generate a distinctive treatment of the schism, its effects, and its causes*. Hence, the text that emerges from the Chronicler's composition clearly has its own independent shape and focus (1990:431-432, emphasis added).

We agree that although the Chronicler has maintained much of the language of 1 Kgs 12 in 2 Chr 10, he has crafted a different approach from his *Vorlage* for his Rehoboam narrative in both small and large ways. We see then the use of potentially allusive language in 2 Chr 10 to Exodus as intentional on the part of the Chronicler and not merely mechanical reuse of the 1 Kings language.[58]

*Coherence*. The internal coherence of the passages in question favors understanding Exodus as the evoked text and 2 Chronicles as the alluding text. Within the text of Chronicles, the use of עֲבֹדָה in a negative way in 2 Chr 10:4 stands out as unique. The word occurs a total of forty-five times in 1-2 Chronicles, of which forty-three are in a positive light, either in relation to a particular line of work, duties for the king, or, most often, serving God as part of cultic worship.[59] Though the word makes sense as it is used in 2 Chr 10:4, it does not fit the pattern of how the Chronicler uses it. As noted above, the more common word within 2 Chr 10 referring to (difficult) work is עֹל ('yoke'). Such a use of עֲבֹדָה is perhaps unexpected and may cause the reader to pause, wondering why the Chronicler has used it in that way. Conversely, the use of עֲבֹדָה in Exod 1-6 is consistent; all nine uses are a negative understanding of labor.

Likewise, the external coherence favors Exodus as the evoked text and 2 Chronicles as the alluding text. Pharaoh is one of the most iconic villains of the HB/OT.[60] Rehoboam is a king of

---

[58] See *Use* below and Provan (1995:103-105).

[59] 1 Chr 4:21; 6:17(32), 33(48); 9:13, 19, 28; 23:24, 26, 28 (x2), 32; 24:3, 19; 25:1 (x2), 6; 26:8, 30; 27:26; 28:13 (x2), 14 (x4), 15, 20, 21 (x2); 29:7; 2 Chr 8:14; 10:4; 12:8 (x2); 24:12; 29:35; 31:2, 16, 21; 34:13 (x2); 35:2, 10, 15, 16. The second use of עֲבֹדָה in 2 Chr 12:8 is a negative one, speaking of servitude to foreign nations. See Klein (2012:186).

[60] See Burns (1987:17-26, esp. 20-22).

mixed moral character at best.[61] It makes more sense for the Chronicler to compare a later king of mixed moral character to a quintessential villain in the midst of the later king's negative conduct rather than for the author of Exodus to compare the principal enemy of God's people to a later (and lesser) king who was at times both good and bad in his conduct.

*Use*. By alluding to Exodus through the above lexical and thematic connections, the Chronicler compares Rehoboam to Pharaoh. Rehoboam is portrayed as a new Pharaoh lording over "all Israel", God's people. This negative comparison is a moral evaluation impacting how we understand Rehoboam as a character. Hicks notes the significance of the people using terms like "heavy yoke" and "harsh labor" in 2 Chr 10:4; he writes: "The charge is a harsh one since it uses language that describes Israel's oppression in Egypt (Exod 5:9; 6:6-9; Lev 26:13). No more radical charge could be made against an Israelite king than that he was treating God's people like the hard-hearted Pharaoh of Egypt" (2001:317). Rehoboam's response to the people after taking counsel heightens the comparison of Rehoboam to Pharaoh. Japhet comments on how the hostile attitude of Rehoboam parallels Pharaoh's response to Moses and Aaron in Exod 5:7-8; it shows "the enstrangement [sic] of the king from his people; this is tyranny unmasked" (1993:655-656).[62] The negative comparison to Pharaoh reaches its climax when it is twice noted that Rehoboam did not listen to the people (v. 15) and to "all Israel" (v. 16). Just as Pharaoh would not listen to the cries of God's people, so Rehoboam did not listen to his own people.[63]

*Recurrence*. The concept of "harsh labor" does not occur elsewhere in Chronicles, but the concept of "not listening" does occur three more times in 2 Chr 25:16, 20; 35:22. The first two instances relate to the actions of King Amaziah; the third is connected to King Josiah. In 2 Chr 25:16, King Amaziah does not listen to the counsel (עֵצָה; cf. 2 Chr 10:8, 13) of a prophet sent from God (25:15).[64] Again in 2 Chr 25:20, King Amaziah does not listen to the threat of King Joash of Israel. Here the text explains that Amaziah does not listen "for it was from God".[65] King Josiah in 2

---

[61] See 5.4.3.

[62] Cf. Klein (2012:160).

[63] The 'turn of affairs' (נְסִבָּה) brought about by God (2 Chr 10:15) does not excuse Rehoboam's actions (contra Amar, 2017:13-14). Rather, 2 Chr 10:16 makes clear that the (rebellious, cf. 10:19) response of "all Israel" occurred upon Rehoboam's not listening (וְכָל־יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי לֹא־שָׁמַע הַמֶּלֶךְ לָהֶם וַיָּשִׁיבוּ הָעָם אֶת־הַמֶּלֶךְ). Cf. Cudworth (2014:506).

[64] Second Chronicles 25:16 has no parallel in Kings.

[65] כִּי מֵהָאֱלֹהִים הִיא. There is evidence of some reworking of 2 Kgs 14:8-10 by the Chronicler in 2 Chr 25:17-19, though much of the verses do match. The phrase "But Amaziah did not listen" (וְלֹא־שָׁמַע אֲמַצְיָהוּ) is present in

Chr 35:22 does not listen to the call of King Neco of Egypt to turn away from him. Neco says in 35:21 that God was with Neco. The narrator confirms this in 35:22, "and he [Josiah] did not listen to the words of Neco from the mouth of God".[66]

A further similarity also helps identify King Amaziah's lack of listening as a recurrent allusion to Pharaoh in the book of Exodus. Japhet rightly connects the use of וְנִשְׂאַךְ לִבְּךָ לְהַכְבִּיד ('and your heart has lifted you to make heavy') in 2 Chr 25:19 to the various iterations of Pharaoh's heart being made heavy (or hardened; כבד לֵב) in Exod 7:14; 8:11(15); 8:28(32); 9:7, 34; 10:1 (1993:868-869). Exodus 8:11(15) specifically connects Pharaoh hardening his heart and not listening. The lifting by Amaziah's heart explains the Chronicler's statement in 25:2 that, although Amaziah did what was right in the eyes of YHWH, he did not do so with a whole heart. The lexical similarities and conceptual connection of God's role in the lack of listening reveal that this multi-faceted allusion to Pharaoh by the Chronicler not only indicates that Amaziah ignored commands he should have obeyed, but Amaziah's status is, in fact, that of an enemy of God, just as the Pharaoh of the Exodus was.

The Chronicler brings the "did not listen" allusion to its ironic climax with King Josiah. This usage of the phrase does not have the same contextual markers as the allusions with Rehoboam (references to labor, brought about by God) and Amaziah (brought about by God). However, a profoundly ironic role reversal aids the lexical connection for identifying an allusion here. As Hicks writes, "The irony is explosive. God uses Israel's long-standing enemy (Egypt) to deliver Josiah, but Josiah will not listen" (2001:527). The irony is that the characterization in the allusion is inverted. Though the Chronicler highly regards Josiah (cf. 2 Chr 34:2), Josiah is not exempt from fault. King Josiah does not listen to the word of God that has come through the current Pharaoh, Neco. Instead, Josiah is acting just like the plague-riddled Pharaoh from Israel's past. The Chronicler uses this subtle allusion to communicate that even the "good" kings can have shameful moments when they act in defiance to God.[67] The reader of Chronicles knows from earlier in the

---

both 2 Kgs 14:11 and 2 Chr 25:20, but the remainder of 2 Chr 25:20 (which includes the noted כִּי clause) is only in the Chronicler's version. He is adding a unique understanding of Amaziah's conduct. See Japhet (1993:869).

[66] וְלֹא שָׁמַע אֶל־דִּבְרֵי נְכֹו מִפִּי אֱלֹהִים. The Chronicler's account here is unique; there is a summary of Josiah's death at the hands of Neco of Egypt in 2 Kgs 23:29, but the events leading up to Josiah's death is not narrated in 2 Kings.

[67] Cf. Hicks (2001:526-528), who also sees parallels between King Josiah and King Ahab in Josiah's disobedience.

book that when a character does not listen, bad things follow. Indeed, following Rehoboam and Amaziah, Josiah does not listen, and it costs him his life (2 Chr 35:23-24).

*Holistic Interpretation*. The Chronicler uses allusions to Pharaoh in the narrative to provide moral evaluations of (at least) three of his characters.[68] One would expect that an allusion to the characteristics of an iconic villain of the HB/OT would result in negative assessments. That expectation is met in the various uses of the allusion. However, with the allusion to Pharaoh in the story of Josiah, the Chronicler controverts the reader's expectations by comparing one of the better kings of Judah to one of Israel's principal enemies.[69] This comparison explains how such a good king could have come to such an abrupt end. In a time of weakness, good King Josiah acted like Egypt's Pharaoh and reaped the consequences of such actions.

*Reciprocation*. The reader of Exodus would rightly understand Pharaoh as an evil character who opposes YHWH, Moses, and Israel. It would be easy to see this vile character as "other" and not like God's people. Reading Exodus with the kings of Judah in mind reminds the reader of Exodus that opposition to, and disobedience of, YHWH can come from both the enemies of God and those who are (initially) understood to follow him. This consideration may then soften the surprise later in Exodus when the reader sees Israel turn its back on the God who rescued them and worship other gods (not unlike Amaziah).

*Historical Implications*. We see from this recurrent allusion and negative comparisons of Judean kings to Pharaoh that the Chronicler is not afraid to evaluate historical figures, even revered ones like kings can be, in a negative light. It is instructive to the post-exilic audience that they too must choose whether they will obey their God or oppose him like Pharaoh and some of their previous kings.

### 3.2.2 – 2 Chr 16:14

King Asa's actions in 2 Chr 14-15 result in positive evaluations from the Chronicler. The king and his people seek (דרשׁ) YHWH and reap positive results such as peace and rest (14:6[7]; 15:12). Yet, in the thirty-sixth year of Asa's reign, when the king of Israel goes up against Judah to build Ramah (16:1), Asa of Judah relies (שׁען) on the king of Aram for help rather than YHWH; this is in

[68] Kings Rehoboam, Amaziah, and Josiah; as noted above, one may also see an implicit moral evaluation of King Solomon in the people's allusive language in 2 Chr 10:4.

[69] Conversely, the reversal of the expected allusion also tells the reader that anyone can speak of, and for, God's will, even a king of Egypt. Anyone can be an enemy of God, and anyone can be his mouthpiece. This prepares the reader for King Cyrus of Persia fulfilling the word of YHWH (2 Chr 36:22-23).

contrast to earlier in Asa's reign when he declares his reliance (שׁען) on YHWH.[70] Hanani, the seer, rebukes King Asa, saying the king's actions were foolish and would thus result in war (16:9). The king reacts poorly, imprisoning Hanani and oppressing some of the people (16:10). Three years later, King Asa becomes sick, but he does not seek (דרשׁ) YHWH. Asa dies some two years later. His burial is the most elaborately described in the book of Chronicles.[71]

*Marker Identification*. The term מִרְקַחַת ('ointment mixture') only appears in three verses in the HB/OT, Exod 30:25; 1 Chr 9:30; and 2 Chr 16:14. Furthermore, we observe additional lexical correspondence between Exod 30:25 and 2 Chr 16:14 (the verb רקח and its associated noun רֹקַח, as well as the noun מַעֲשֶׂה), and between 1 Chr 9:30 and 2 Chr 16:14 (the plural noun בְּשָׂמִים). These connections are displayed below (with spacing inserted to assist recognition):

Exod 30:25

וְעָשִׂיתָ אֹתוֹ שֶׁמֶן מִשְׁחַת־קֹדֶשׁ רֹקַח מִרְקַחַת מַעֲשֵׂה רֹקֵחַ שֶׁמֶן מִשְׁחַת־קֹדֶשׁ יִהְיֶה׃

1 Chr 9:30

וּמִן־בְּנֵי הַכֹּהֲנִים רֹקְחֵי הַמִּרְקַחַת לַבְּשָׂמִים׃

2 Chr 16:14

וַיִּקְבְּרֻהוּ בְקִבְרֹתָיו אֲשֶׁר כָּרָה־לוֹ בְּעִיר דָּוִיד וַיַּשְׁכִּיבֻהוּ בַּמִּשְׁכָּב אֲשֶׁר מִלְּאוּ בְּשָׂמִים וְזָנִים מְרֻקָּחִים בְּמִרְקַחַת מַעֲשֶׂה וַיִּשְׂרְפוּ־לוֹ שְׂרֵפָה גְּדוֹלָה עַד־לִמְאֹד׃

The Chronicler has significantly reworked the text of 1 Kgs 15:23-24 in 2 Chr 16:11-14, including the addition of the noted key terms; this is his own lexical connection rather than utilizing an association from another source such as 1 Kgs 15.[72]

We do not observe similarities between the two literary contexts.[73] In the context of Exod 30:22-33, YHWH instructs Moses regarding the creation of a special oil for anointing the tabernacle

---

[70] King Asa prays in 2 Chr 14:10(11): "Help us, O YHWH our God, for on you we rely (שׁען)".

[71] Regarding King Asa's burial description in Chronicles, Japhet notes (1) only one "basic" similarity to the record in 1 Kgs 15:24 and (2) the "funeral description" for Asa in 2 Chr 16:14 "is the longest recorded for any king…" (1993:739). See also Beentjes (2015:151). Most kings' deaths in Chronicles are narrated simply with only some of the kings getting a brief mention of their burials. Even King David receives only a simple summation of his death with no mention of his burial (1 Chr 29:28). Solomon's burial description is: "…and they buried him [Solomon] in the city of David his father" (2 Chr 9:31).

[72] Cf. Snyman (2011:258-260); Beentjes (2015:141-142); Amar (2019:337-338).

[73] The literary context of 1 Chr 9:30 is discussed below in *Recurrence*.

and its items as well as Aaron and his sons for their service as priests. The oil and what the oil touches are called 'holy' (or 'sacred') multiple times (30:25, 29, 31, 32). The oil is meant to be used throughout all the people's generations (30:31). It is not meant for the skin of a regular man, nor can anyone replicate its recipe for use outside of the specified anointings (30:32).[74] Anyone who makes an oil like it or uses the oil for something not specified (זָר, 'strange') is to be cut off from his people (30:33).[75] Second Chronicles 16:14 indicates that King Asa had arranged his own burial place before his death. The following clauses indicate that King Asa had also arranged for the spices and oils used in his burial.[76]

*Coherence*. It is sensible to discuss an ointment mixture for the tabernacle in the broader context of tabernacle instructions and immediately following a list of components in said ointment's recipe (Exod 30:23-24). In Chronicles, spices (בֹּשֶׂם) are mentioned in the context of Levitical work (1 Chr 9:29-30), wealth and gifts (2 Chr 9:1, 9, 24; 32:27), and burial (here in 2 Chr 16:14). The use of 'ointment mixture' in 1 Chr 9:30 does not seem unwarranted with spices mentioned in the context. Regarding 2 Chr 16:14, if we understand Jer 34:5 to be a reference to burning spices at a king's burial (as do multiple English translations; e.g., ESV, RSV, NAS, NET), then the practice of burning spices mentioned in 2 Chr 16:14 does not surprise the reader, and the use of 'ointment mixture' would not necessarily be out of place (cf. Japhet, 1993:739).[77] However, if Jer 34:5 does

---

[74] Note the emphatic fronting of the prepositional phrase: עַל־בְּשַׂר אָדָם לֹא יִיסָךְ. See also Stuart (2006:645).

[75] This punishment is dictated elsewhere for wrongs such as uncircumcision (Gen 17:14), breaking the Sabbath (Exod 31:14), dietary law breaking (Lev 7:20, 21, 25, 27; 19:8), sexual misconduct (Lev 18:29), and idolatry and idolatrous sacrifices (Lev 20:3, 5). See Stuart (2006:283-285) and Dozeman (2009:671).

[76] וַיְקַבְּרֻהוּ בְקִבְרֹתָיו אֲשֶׁר כָּרָה־לוֹ בְּעִיר דָּוִיד וַיַּשְׁכִּיבֻהוּ בַּמִּשְׁכָּב אֲשֶׁר מִלֵּא בְּשָׂמִים וּזְנִים מְרֻקָּחִים בְּמִרְקַחַת מַעֲשֵׂה. We understand the second אֲשֶׁר clause of 2 Chr 16:14 to function similarly to the first; the perfect third masculine singular verb refers to King Asa as the subject (so NAS). Several English translations and at least one commentator (e.g., KJV, ESV, RSV, NRSV, NIV, NET, Klein [2012:235, 243]) do not understand or render מִלֵּא as an active *Piel* verb as in the MT, but as a passive (*Niphal*) verb. Klein acknowledges in his textual notes that the verb is indeed a *Piel* perfect, but does not treat it as such; he says the verb's subject is indefinite, citing BDB. Japhet's commentary sources the RSV text throughout; she does not comment on the RSV's rendering of 16:14 in this section (1993:730). However, she later notes the active verb and states: "Asa probably made all the extravagant preparations in his lifetime" (739). Given that the perfect third masculine singular verb in the previous אֲשֶׁר clause refers to Asa, we understand the subject of מִלֵּא to be King Asa as well. This seems sensible; if the king had arranged for his own tomb to be dug (we assume he himself did not do the digging), presumably he would have also arranged for the various elements of his burial (such as spices to be used). Ultimately, whether the subject is Asa himself or not, the lexical connection in 2 Chr 16:14 to Exod 30:25 still indicates an inappropriate use of the מִרְקַחַת.

[77] Klein writes that Jer 34:5 "suggests that spices may have been the material that was burned" but recognizes that the word "spices" is never expressed (2012:243).

not speak of spice burning (there is no mention of spices or incense in the Hebrew; cf. Zwickel, 1989), then the mention of an 'ointment mixture' for burial is less expected and seems incongruous (cf. Carr, 2001:111), indicating that 2 Chr 16:14 is an alluding text.

Externally, if 2 Chr 16:14 is alluding to the instructions of Exod 30, then the Chronicler is negatively assessing the use of this ointment mixture for burial purposes. If Exod 30:25 is alluding to 2 Chr 16:14, we would have an example of Exodus using a contrasting, negative example of a king's burial to indicate how this special ointment mixture is to be used for the tabernacle and priests only. While the latter option is possible, the former seems more plausible; it is likely to have an evaluation based upon established protocol rather than to establish a regulation with a subtle reference to how *not* to do it.

Combined with the understood dating of Chronicles and Exodus and the observed coherence of the passages, we see 2 Chr 16:14 as the alluding text and Exod 30:25 as the evoked text.

*Use*. The connection in 2 Chr 16:14 to the command in Exod 30 that the special ointment mixture only be used for anointing the holy place of worship and its priests indicates that the allusion is an indictment against the burial practices for King Asa. If we are correct above that the subject of the verb מִלֵּא in 2 Chr 16:14 is Asa, then the indictment is against the king himself for making these arrangements for his own burial. This indictment aligns with the last assessment provided by the Chronicler about King Asa: he did not seek YHWH (2 Chr 16:12). How then do we correlate this with the seemingly positive treatment by his people in the final clause of 2 Chr 16:14?[78] Several commentators understand King Asa's burial positively, but they also do not write of a connection to Exod 30 (Myers, 1965:95; Hicks, 2001:358; Tuell, 2001:175; Snyman, 2011:259; Klein, 2012:243; Amar, 2019:348-349). Jonker does not write of the connection to Exod 30 but does note an uncertainty present in the text: "The ambiguity of the Chronicler's portrayal of Asa continues up until his death notice. Although honor was given to this king, he could not be buried with his ancestors in the city of David" (2013a:225). Japhet does not write about the connection to Exod 30 either but lists two possible options for evaluating the lengthy description of this "honourable" burial (including the burning). In her first option, she astutely hypothesizes that despite his two-year illness before his death, "Asa probably made all the extravagant preparations in

[78] וַיִּשְׂרְפוּ־לוֹ שְׂרֵפָה גְּדוֹלָה עַד־לִמְאֹד, "and they burned for him an exceedingly great burning". Cf. 2 Chr 21:19 where the Chronicler notes Jehoram's "people did not do a burning for him like the burning of his fathers" ( וְלֹא־עָשׂוּ לוֹ עַמּוֹ שְׂרֵפָה כִּשְׂרֵפַת אֲבֹתָיו) and Jer 34:5, which may be related to 2 Chr 16:14 and 21:19 as noted in the previous step.

his lifetime" (1993:739).[79] One can secure an honorable burial if one makes the arrangements ahead of time. Even if the people initiated the burning and it was not by arrangement of the king, we see elsewhere in Chronicles, in close proximity, examples of both negative and positive assessments of the same person. This allusion does not change the Chronicler's overall positive assessment of King Asa (cf. 2 Chr 20:32 and 21:12) but does show how this burial contradicted the Torah and adds further to the mixed nature of specific points of his life (and death). Though he understands the burial as honorable, Hicks writes concerning how the Bible portrays Asa as a complex character: the Deuteronomist "recognizes Asa as a good king. The Chronicler accepts that judgment as well, but the dynamic relationship between God and his people is more complicated than a broad generalization. The Chronicler recognizes the ups and downs of Asa's faith" (2001:358).[80]

*Recurrence*. As noted, the word מִרְקַחַת appears in 1 Chr 9:30.[81] That context centers on the various roles and responsibilities held by the Levites upon their return from exile. Among them, those from the sons of the priests were responsible for the mixing of the ointment mixture of spices (רֹקְחֵי הַמִּרְקַחַת לַבְּשָׂמִים). As Klein observes about the various duties, "In Chronicles all of these duties except for the spices are transferred to those Levites who were not priests" (2006:278; cf. Japhet, 1993:218). The mixture's creation was initially commanded of Moses in Exod 30:25. "While no one is explicitly designated to follow him in this, the general division of charges in the Pentateuch makes it likely that these preparations were a priestly prerogative" (Japhet, 1993:218). The Chronicler informs his readers that while other responsibilities were delegated, this special mixture's creation was (still) in the hands of the priests only.

*Holistic Interpretation*. We see from how the Chronicler uses the term מִרְקַחַת that he understands Exod 30 to be clear; this is a special oil reserved only for the place of YHWH's worship and those who attend to the priestly functions there. Any use or preparation outside of what the Torah specifies is wrong. Even as other temple duties were given to non-priestly Levites, duties relating to this special 'ointment mixture' were still for priests only.

---

[79] The first and second portions of 2 Chr 16:14 both contain relative clauses that indicate King Asa's involvement in those procedures. Though the final portion of the verse (regarding the burning) does not likewise express King Asa's involvement, it is reasonable to assume he would have had a hand in that as well. Japhet's second option relates to an Aramaic and "midrashic interpretation of Asa's name" (1993:739-740). The argumentation for this option is not strong. Beentjes also mentions this second option, labeling it a "curious side effect" and noting it as a subtle possibility (2015:151).

[80] Cf. Dillard's overview of Asa's life (1980:211-213).

[81] First Chronicles 9:30 does not have a parallel in another biblical source such as Samuel or Kings.

*Reciprocation*. How might the reader of Exod 30:22-33 understand this ointment compound being misused? What incorrect usage would result in people being cut off from others (Exod 30:33)? Though we understand Exod 30:25 as the evoked text in this allusion, the *Coherence* step above yielded the consideration of 2 Chr 16:14 providing a negative example for the use of the ointment mixture. This ointment is not for the burial of the dead, but only in preparation for worship of the God who lives.

*Historical Implications*. The Chronicler brings an earlier Israelite recipe and practice to his post-exilic time of writing by alluding to Exod 30, thus honoring the command of Exod 30:31 that the instructions regarding the ointment mixture are meant for all generations. This shows high regard for the pentateuchal text and an honoring of what was sacred for previous generations.

### 3.2.3 – 2 Chr 19:10

After fighting alongside King Ahab of Israel, King Jehoshaphat of Judah returns to Jerusalem. The seer Jehu confronts Jehoshaphat, both denouncing Jehoshaphat's wicked assistance of Ahab and approving of Jehoshaphat's destruction of the Asheroth and seeking of YHWH. King Jehoshaphat then goes throughout his land to bring the people back to God. The remainder of 2 Chr 19 tells of Jehoshaphat setting up a judicial system throughout Judah.

*Marker Identification*. The verb זהר ('to teach, warn') appears infrequently in the HB/OT, only twenty-three times, and fewer times still in the *Hiphil* stem.[82] The nouns חֹק ('statute') and תּוֹרָה ('law') appear together in only sixteen verses in the HB/OT.[83] All three words appear together only in Exod 18:20 and 2 Chr 19:10; in both verses, זהר is in the *Hiphil* stem.[84]

---

[82] The verb appears in Exod 18:20; 2 Kgs 6:10 (x2); 2 Chr 19:10; Ps 19:12; Eccl 4:13; 12:12; Ezek 3:17, 18 (x2), 19, 20, 21 (x2); 8:2; 33:3, 4, 5 (x2), 6, 7, 8, 9; Dan 12:3 (x2). It is found in the *Hiphil* stem fifteen times in Exod 18:20; 2 Kgs 6:10 (x2); 2 Chr 19:10; Ezek 3:17, 18 (x2), 19, 20, 21; 33:3, 7, 8, 9; 12:3.

[83] Exod 18:16, 20; Lev 26:46; Deut 4:8; 17:19; 2 Kgs 17:37; 2 Chr 19:10; 33:8; Ezra 7:10; Neh 9:13, 14; 10:30; Ps 105:45; Isa 24:5; Amos 2:4; Mal 3:22.

[84] Cf. Knoppers, who notes these lexical connections and then writes, "The use of the verb זהר with a double accusative is found only in these two texts (Exod 18:20; 2 Chr 19:10)" (1994:76-77, here 77).

Exod 18:20

וְהִזְהַרְתָּה אֶתְהֶם אֶת־הַחֻקִּים וְאֶת־הַתּוֹרֹת

וְהוֹדַעְתָּ לָהֶם אֶת־הַדֶּרֶךְ יֵלְכוּ בָהּ וְאֶת־הַמַּעֲשֶׂה אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשׂוּן׃

2 Chr 19:10a

וְכָל־רִיב אֲשֶׁר־יָבוֹא עֲלֵיכֶם מֵאֲחֵיכֶם הַיֹּשְׁבִים בְּעָרֵיהֶם

בֵּין־דָּם לְדָם בֵּין־תּוֹרָה לְמִצְוָה לְחֻקִּים וּלְמִשְׁפָּטִים וְהִזְהַרְתֶּם אֹתָם וְלֹא יֶאְשְׁמוּ לַיהוָה

There is no parallel to 2 Chr 19:10 in Kings, so any lexical connection between 2 Chr 19:10 and Exodus is the Chronicler's unique contribution.

We also observe two conceptual connections between 2 Chr 19 and Exod 18. The first is their contexts. Both chapters discuss setting up judges for a judicial system.[85] In Exod 18, Jethro affirms Moses' role to teach the people and recommends delegating judicial responsibilities to others so that Moses does not become worn out. Moses takes his father-in-law's advice and sets up the system as recommended. In 2 Chr 19, Jehoshaphat appoints judges throughout Judah. The second conceptual connection is a close, but not exact, lexical connection around the concept of fearing God. In Exod 18:21, Jethro recommends Moses look for men who fear God (יִרְאֵי אֱלֹהִים), are trustworthy, and hate dishonest gain. In 2 Chr 19:7, Jehoshaphat exhorts the judges he appoints, "And now, let the dread of YHWH (פַּחַד־יְהוָה) be on you all, keep and do, for there is not with YHWH our God injustice or partiality, or taking a bribe." Further, in 19:9, he says: "Thus you shall do in fear of YHWH (יִרְאַת יְהוָה), in trustworthiness, and with a whole heart…".[86] One also observes

[85] Knoppers rightly observes that the motivation bringing about the establishment of the judicial systems is different in each passage (1994:72), but the contexts are still similar. Note the repeated use of שׁפט in 2 Chr 19:5, 6 (x2) and Exod 18:13, 16, 22 (x2), 26 (x2). Scholars also note connections to various passages in Deuteronomy such as Deut 1:9-18; 10:17; 16:18-20; 17:8-13; 32:8 (see, e.g., Japhet, 1993:777-778; Knoppers, 1994; Klein, 2012:275-277). Such connections do not negate the lexical connections to Exod 18 present in the text. Rather, speaking of Deut 17:8 and Exod 18:20, Knoppers says the lexical connections present in 2 Chr 19:10 evidence a "literary dependence of the Chronicler's composition" on both texts (1994:77).

[86] The concepts of fear and truth/trustworthiness do appear together elsewhere in the HB/OT, but the lexical and contextual connections between Exod 18 and 2 Chr 19 incline us to see these conceptual connections as additional evidence of a link between Exod 18 and 2 Chr 19. יִרְאָה and אֱמוּנָה are found in 2 Chr 19:9 and Isa 33:6. The context of the latter is a prophecy promising deliverance to God's people and not a judicial context, thus discouraging us from seeing a connection to 2 Chr 19:9. ירא and אֱמֶת appear together in Exod 18:21; Josh 24:14; 1 Sam 12:24; Neh 7:2; Ps

connections regarding trustworthiness and financial integrity, but Knoppers (1994:78) argues well that those concepts in 2 Chr 19 stem from Deut 10:17; 32:8 rather than Exodus.[87]

*Coherence*. The internal and external coherence of 2 Chr 19:10 inclines the reader to understand the verse as alluding to Exod 18. The unique phrase בֵּין־דָּם לְדָם ('between blood to blood'; found elsewhere only in Deut 17:8) appears in 2 Chr 19:10, immediately followed by the word בֵּין just like in Deut 17:8. However, the word connected to this second בֵּין is not what is found in Deut 17:8. What follows is language with connections to Exod 18. This strikes the reader as unexpected. Either the Chronicler has combined two pentateuchal texts here (thus implying that 2 Chr 19 is the alluding text) or the texts of Exod 18 and Deut 17 were written in a *very* selective manner, both alluding to 2 Chr 19 but excluding the specific elements of the other interwoven text. Regarding the external coherence of 2 Chr 19:10, it seems more sensible for the Chronicler to allude to the judicial system of Moses, the foundational leader of God's people, to support King Jehoshaphat's own judicial system rather than Jehoshaphat, a good but albeit imperfect king (cf. 2 Chr 20:33, 35-37; and 5.4.3 below), being the standard for Moses. Knoppers also notes the simpler structure of the system in Exodus makes it more likely to have been built upon by the Chronicler, rather than the writer of Exodus simplifying a more complex system from Chronicles (1994:74).

*Use*. The Chronicler gives legitimacy to King Jehoshaphat's judicial system by alluding to Moses' in Exod 18 (as well as various passages in Deuteronomy). If a biblical author is trying to establish a king's administration as good and right, comparing that administration to how Moses conducted the nation's affairs is a positive step. Knoppers sees the significance of the allusion(s) and how the Chronicler has expanded on the previous systems:

> The Jerusalem tribunal established by Jehoshaphat therefore combines elements found separately in other courts. The Chronicler collocates two independent and otherwise isolated linguistic forms, located in Deut 17:8 and Exod 18:20 respectively, and blends them in his own presentation. The literary dependency of the Chronicler's composition on both of these older traditions is therefore indisputable. The representation of older lemmata in 2 Chr 19:4b-11 serves to sanction the Chronicler's system of justice.

---

45:5(4); 86:11. Additionally, יִרְאָה and אֱמֶת appear together in Ps 19:10(9) and Prov 16:6. Again, none of these other contexts speak of judges or judicial systems.

[87] Jeon (2017:298-299) notes these conceptual connections between Exod 18 and 2 Chr 19 but does not account for Knoppers's arguments pointing to the language of trustworthiness and financial integrity in 2 Chr 19 coming from Deuteronomy. Jeon cites Knoppers's article on the following page, so Jeon was aware of Knoppers's article at the time of his writing.

> Jehoshaphat's judiciary resembles both Moses' judiciary and the judiciary mandated on the Plains of Moab. But the Chronicler does not simply duplicate and combine older legal material. He selects, supplements, and hence transforms earlier forensic theory and precedent. The judiciary he posits in Jehoshaphat's reign resonates with certain features of both Moses' judicial reform and the Deuteronomic reform, yet ultimately manifests the Chronicler's own distinctive perspective (1994:77).

In addition to the analogical appeal to Moses' authority and prominence, we see with Knoppers in the Chronicler's allusions in 2 Chr 19:10 an amalgamation of the two sources (Exodus and Deuteronomy) and a transformation into a new entity grounded in the Torah. Knoppers argues well that this transformed (and transcending) system is evident in both the officials' roles and the paraenesis Jehoshaphat gives those officials (74-79). We see a comparable combination of older sources and transformation into a new reality later in 3.2.15 related to the Passover legislation in 2 Chr 35:13.

*Recurrence*. The sending of leaders throughout the land to teach the law of YHWH in 2 Chr 17:7-9 certainly has connections to the appointment of judges to administer justice throughout the land in 2 Chr 19.[88] We must determine, though, if there is an allusion present in 2 Chr 17:7-9 to Exod 18.[89]

Lexical and conceptual connections exist between the two passages.[90] The lexical overlaps between Exod 18:20-21 and 2 Chr 17:7-9 are the words תּוֹרָה ('law') and שַׂר ('chief, official').[91] In Exod 18:20, תּוֹרָה functions as an object of the verb זהר. In 2 Chr 17:9, תּוֹרָה appears in a construct chain (סֵפֶר תּוֹרַת יְהוָה, 'the scroll of the law of YHWH') in a verbless clause adjacent to a verbal clause containing למד ('to teach'). The implication appears to be that the scroll of the law of YHWH was the content of the teaching. In Exod 18:21, Jethro recommends that Moses set up (שׂים) officials (שַׂר) to adjudicate between the people. In 2 Chr 17:7, King Jehoshaphat sends (שׁלח) officials (שַׂר) to teach the people. The conceptual overlap consists of teaching (זהר) people

---

[88] See Knoppers (1994).

[89] There is no parallel narrative in Kings for 2 Chr 17:7-9, so any potential recurrent allusion is unique to the Chronicler.

[90] We note again Kynes's point that recurrences need not be as strong or obvious (2012:55; cf. 37-38; see 2.3.5).

[91] The parallel of Exod 18 in Deut 1 also mentions שַׂר in Deut 1:15, but Deut 1 does not contain the element of teaching as Exod 18 does.

the ways of YHWH (in Exod 18:20) and sending officials to teach (למד) the people the ways of YHWH (in 2 Chr 19:7-9).

Turning to the allusion's function in 2 Chr 17:7-9,[92] we see the allusion's use in 2 Chr 17 is similar to its use in 2 Chr 19. Here in 2 Chr 17, the Chronicler compares King Jehoshaphat to Moses and shows how, like Moses, King Jehoshaphat spreads the law of YHWH among his people (cf. Klein, 2012:251).

*Holistic Interpretation*. The Chronicler accomplishes two things by comparing Jehoshaphat to Moses through his allusions in 2 Chr 17 and 19. First, the author elevates the status of Jehoshaphat by saying he is like one of Israel's most revered figures. Second, he validates the judicial system established by Jehoshaphat by rooting it firmly in the tradition of Moses.

*Reciprocation*. Moses' father-in-law, Jethro, recommends an administrative system at the outset of Israel's functioning as a nation. We see in Deut 1 that his recommendations are still considered viable some forty years later. However, what is this system's long-term legacy? Can this system be used throughout Israel's history? Is it amenable to use during a monarchy or even during a post-exilic time when Israel lacks a king on the throne? When we read Exod 18 in light of Jehoshaphat's reign, we see that Jethro's recommendations to Moses have immense longevity and are just as relevant in the time of Jehoshaphat and beyond as they were when Moses led God's people.

*Historical Implications*. We can observe at least two historical implications with the present allusion. First, we see how the Chronicler valued the Torah and reinforced for his readers its status as key to the people of God seeking and following their God. Hicks, referencing Dillard, writes, "The Chronicler's allusion to Mosaic commandments throughout his narrative underscores the importance of the testimony of the written covenant… The Chronicler appeals to an authoritative body of writings that served a canonical function" (2001:363). Second, the Chronicler writes Jehoshaphat's narrative when Israel lacked its own king and, in that narrative, alludes to a time in Israel's history before they had kings. The Chronicler creates a parallel between the time of the evoked text and the time of writing. By placing Jehoshaphat's judicial system on the foundation of Moses' judiciary yet then transcending that foundation, the Chronicler presents an ideal of "what he believes justice should be" (Knoppers, 1994:62, 79-80, here 80) and what justice could and should look like in a time of Israel having no king.

---

[92] Kynes notes one may assume the direction of dependence when discussing recurrence (2012:55).

### 3.2.4 – 2 Chr 20:3-29

Second Chronicles 20 opens with enemies coming against King Jehoshaphat and Judah for battle. Both the king and the people respond rightly by seeking YHWH.[93] Jehoshaphat stands among the people and prays to YHWH (20:5-12). In reply, the Spirit of YHWH comes upon Jahaziel. Jahaziel speaks with encouragement and commands from YHWH. Jehoshaphat and the people react with worship and obedience. YHWH gives Jehoshaphat and Judah the victory, and the people rejoice.

*Marker Identification*. There are numerous lexical, conceptual, and structural connections between 2 Chr 20 and Exod 14.[94] The majority lie in 2 Chr 20:15-17 and Exod 14:13-14. The relevant text of 2 Chr 20 does not appear in Kings and so is unique to the Chronicler. In both contexts, the people of God face an intimidating army and fear that they are soon to meet their end. We see lexical similarities below:

| Exodus 14 | 2 Chronicles 20 |
|---|---|
| v. 10 - מְאֹד **וַיִּירְאוּ** | v. 3 - **וַיִּירָא** |
| v. 13 - **אַל־תִּירָאוּ** | v. 15 - **אַל־תִּירְאוּ** וְאַל־תֵּחַתּוּ |
| | v. 17 - **אַל־תִּירְאוּ** וְאַל־תֵּחַתּוּ |
| v. 14 - **יְהוָה** **יִלָּחֶם לָכֶם** וְאַתֶּם תַּחֲרִישׁוּן | v. 15 - כִּי לֹא לָכֶם הַמִּלְחָמָה כִּי לֵאלֹהִים[95] |
| v. 25 - כִּי **יְהוָה נִלְחָם** לָהֶם בְּמִצְרָיִם | v. 17 - **לֹא לָכֶם לְהִלָּחֵם** בָּזֹאת |
| | v. 29 - כִּי **נִלְחַם יְהוָה** עִם אוֹיְבֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל |

The most significant lexical connection between the two passages is in Exod 14:13 and 2 Chr 20:17, as noted below (with spacing inserted to assist recognition). The phrase "and see the salvation of YHWH" only appears in Exod 14:13 and 2 Chr 20:17 in the HB/OT. Prior to this phrase appearing in 2 Chr 20, the people of God fearing and receiving exhortation not to fear but understand who truly fights for them could be connected to any number of other places in the

---

[93] In 2 Chr 20:3, Jehoshaphat seeks (דרשׁ) YHWH. The following verse notes twice that Judah came to seek (בקשׁ) YHWH.

[94] Most of the lexical and conceptual connections have been identified and discussed by scholars, but the structural similarities are not discussed often. For lexical and conceptual connections, see, e.g., Klein (2012:289-290); Japhet (1993:794-795); Tuell (2001:183); Knoppers (1999:70); and Hicks (2001:385). DeVries does provide an examination of the structure of 2 Chr 20:1-30 but does not connect the passage to Exod 14 (1975:104-105). For a brief comparison of the two passages' structures, see Beentjes (1993:265).

[95] Knoppers also observes connections between this phrase in 2 Chr 20:15 and 1 Sam 17:47 (1999:70).

HB/OT. These are not uncommon themes or ideas. However, this key phrase, the *Hithpael* imperative of **יצב**, and the second masculine plural "for/with you" confirm a clear lexical connection between Exod 14 and 2 Chr 20.

Exod 14:13

הִתְיַצְּבוּ וּרְאוּ אֶת־יְשׁוּעַת יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר־יַעֲשֶׂה לָכֶם

2 Chr 20:17

הִתְיַצְּבוּ עִמְדוּ וּרְאוּ אֶת־יְשׁוּעַת יְהוָה עִמָּכֶם

We observe conceptual connections along with the lexical similarities. In Exod 14:14, Israel is told they will be silent since YHWH will fight for them. In 2 Chr 20:17, the people of God are told they need not fear because the battle does not belong to them but God. There are temporal notations in both passages: Exod 14:13 twice mentions "today", and 2 Chr 20:16-17 twice uses "tomorrow". YHWH says to Moses in Exod 14:15 to tell the people to set out (in the face of what would presumably seem to them to be danger); an instruction in 2 Chr 20:17 is for the people to go out to face the enemies. Amzallag observes that "[i]n both cases, the miraculous victory is obtained without any military confrontation (Exod. 14:25-27; 2 Chron. 20:23)" (2016:182). A gruesome conceptual connection to Exod 14 is found in 2 Chr 20:24. Exodus 14:30 says, "And Israel saw Egypt dead on the edge of the sea."[96] Though the words are different, 2 Chr 20:24 tells a similar story: "And Judah came to the watchtower of the wilderness. And they turned to the multitude, and behold, corpses were lying on the ground! And there were none who escaped."[97]

Lastly, we see the structural similarities in the two passages:

[96] וַיַּרְא יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־מִצְרַיִם מֵת עַל־שְׂפַת הַיָּם.

[97] וְיהוּדָה בָּא עַל־הַמִּצְפֶּה לַמִּדְבָּר וַיִּפְנוּ אֶל־הֶהָמוֹן וְהִנָּם פְּגָרִים נֹפְלִים אַרְצָה וְאֵין פְּלֵיטָה.

| Event | Exodus | 2 Chronicles |
|---|---|---|
| Enemies approach | 14:9 | 20:1-2 |
| Response of fear | 14:10 | 20:3 |
| Appeal to YHWH | 14:10 | 20:3-4 |
| The people complain | 14:11-12 | - |
| The leader and people pray[98] | - | 20:5-13 |
| Man of God encourages the people | 14:13-14 | 20:14-17 |
| YHWH defeats the enemies | 14:24-28 | 20:22-23 |
| Seeing the slain | 14:30 | 20:24 |
| Response with music | 15:1ff.[99] | 20:28 |

The lexical, conceptual, and structural similarities indicate a clear connection between 2 Chr 20 and Exod 14.

*Coherence*. The internal coherence of Exod 14:13 and 2 Chr 20:17 and their surrounding contexts do not indicate the direction of dependence. Similar arguments can be made for the addition/omission of parts of the verses in question. The verb עִמְדוּ is not in Exod 14 yet appears in 2 Chr 20:17. Also, the relative clause אֲשֶׁר־יַעֲשֶׂה in Exod 14:13 is not present in 2 Chr 20:17. One could argue that the presence of the verb עִמְדוּ in 2 Chr 20:17 is awkward and repetitive after הִתְיַצְּבוּ and thus shows the Chronicler trying to place his allusion around other material he wanted to include. Conversely, one could say that the repetitive nature of the verb indicates that the Exodus author removed it for simplicity's sake. Similar arguments can be made for the relative clause. The Chronicler perhaps omitted it since YHWH's salvation would not come "today", as indicated in Exod 14:13, so he need not include the relative clause that led up to the temporal proclamation. On the other hand, one could see Exod 14:13 as alluding with its addition and expansion of the promise of salvation, "which he will do".[100] Lastly, the passages around both verses include material not

---

[98] Regarding the people praying *with* Jehoshaphat, see Klein (2012:288).

[99] Of note, Amzallag observes "Two of the three peoples fighting against Jehoshaphat (Edom and Moab) are pointedly mentioned in the Song of the Sea (Exod. 15:15; 2 Chron. 20:2, 10, 22–23)" (2016:182). Furthermore, the peoples mentioned in Exod 15:15 (which also include all the inhabitants of Canaan) are said to have terror and dread (וְפַחַד אֵימָתָה) fall on them in Exod 15:16. In 2 Chr 20:29, all the kingdoms of the lands are said to have the dread of God (פַּחַד אֱלֹהִים) on them as a result of the victory.

[100] The difference of preposition in Exod 14:13 (לָכֶם) versus 2 Chr 20:17 (עִמָּכֶם) could be argued in favor of both directions as well.

present in the other, so questions of which passage added or omitted material are not easily answered.

The external coherence of these passages indicates that 2 Chr 20 is the alluding text and Exod 14 the evoked text. This "battle" in 2 Chr 20 is significant in the narrative of Jehoshaphat's reign and evidence of YHWH protecting his people, but the "battle" in Exod 14 is significant for Israel's history overall and the whole of the HB/OT. If Exod 14 were alluding to 2 Chr 20, it would lessen the status of the victory at the Red Sea. It makes more sense for a "lesser" battle tale to refer to a famous one, thus increasing the status of the lesser.

*Use*. Why would the Chronicler provide so many connections to Exod 14? What did he aim to evoke by comparing the battle in 2 Chr 20 to the battle at the Red Sea? We believe the most explicit part of the allusion guides the study here; namely, the phrase "Take your stand… and see the salvation of YHWH…".

In Exod 14:13, this key phrase is part of Moses' response to the people's fear. The constituents of Pharaoh's formidable army are described in 14:9, and understandably, the people fear greatly as the army approaches and comes (נסע) after them (14:10). Initially, the response of the people seems commendable; they cry out (צעק) to YHWH. However, the narrative takes an unexpected turn when the people complain to Moses in the following two verses, reiterating a previously communicated desire for Moses to leave them alone and suggesting it would have been better for them to stay under Egyptian slavery. Moses responds in Exod 14:13-14 by trying to allay their fears and reaffirming that YHWH will act on their behalf; in fact, they only need to be silent or remain still (חרשׁ).[101] Ironically, immediately after Moses says the people only need to be silent or be still, YHWH asks Moses why Moses is crying out (צעק) to him, instructs him to tell the people to move (נסע), and indicates to Moses how they are to cross the sea on dry ground. This indicates that the sense of the verb חרשׁ in v. 14 is not actual physical silence or lack of movement by the people, but a contrast to the fighting that YHWH will do for them.[102] They will not be the ones to

[101] See Stuart (2006:336) for a fuller discussion on the meaning of תַּחֲרִישׁוּן here.

[102] The fronting of the unrequired pronoun אַתֶּם in the final clause of Exod 14:14 further indicates an emphasized contrast between what YHWH will do (in the first half of the verse) and what the people need to do to see their salvation come from YHWH.

engage in the fight. YHWH then repeats in 14:17-18 what he initially told Moses in v. 4. YHWH will be the victor over Pharaoh and the various constituents of Pharaoh's army.

The Spirit of YHWH is on Jahaziel when he says in 2 Chr 20:15-17 that all Judah, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and King Jehoshaphat do not own this upcoming battle and will not fight.[103] What is the warrant for such claims? How can Jahaziel (and the Spirit) say these things? We understand the following phrase in 20:17 to be the answer. When the key phrase from Exod 14:13 is spoken in 2 Chr 20:17, the God-sanctioned lack of fighting comes with it. Knoppers writes: "As at the Red Sea, non-participation is nothing more and nothing less than the divinely mandated role the people are to play in this particular conflict" (1999:71). Jahaziel has taken YHWH's victory at the Red Sea as evidence for the confidence to trust in and wait for YHWH's provision. As Moses assuaged the people's fear with an assurance of YHWH's salvation, so Jahaziel comforts Jehoshaphat and the people. As YHWH delivered his people from the hand of their enemies without them needing to fight for themselves, so he will do again. "Just as God had fought for Israel against Egypt at the Red Sea… so God will fight now against Ammon, Moab, and Edom" (Tuell, 2001:183). This allusion to Exod 14 provides hope to people who are afraid.

*Recurrence*. This study did not find further allusions to Exod 14 by the Chronicler.

*Holistic Interpretation*. Though we find no other reference to Exod 14 in Chronicles, we take this opportunity to highlight one aspect of interpreting 2 Chr 20 that this allusion to Exod 14 requires. Beentjes argues, "From this parallel structure, one can draw no other conclusion than that the frame of 2 Chr 20 is determined to a high degree by Exod 14. The close textual and structural relationship between 2 Chr 20,14-17 and Exod 14,13-14 should therefore also be connected with the interpretation of the final address of the narrative" (1993:265-266). With the strong connection to Exod 14, we can say the Chronicler has intentionally used this allusion to Exod 14 as part of his

---

[103] The phrase לֹא לָכֶם לְהִלָּחֵם is curious from a grammatical standpoint. There are certainly other, more straightforward ways of stating in Biblical Hebrew that someone will not do something or commanding someone to not do something. Why would the Chronicler arrange this phrase this way, using a prefixed infinitive construct preceded by the subject? The author appears to echo his statement in 20:15 "for not to you is the battle" (כִּי לֹא לָכֶם הַמִּלְחָמָה). Here in 20:17 the author uses the same initial לֹא לָכֶם, and instead of the noun מִלְחָמָה, the Chronicler appears to use the infinitive construct of לחם because that verb appears in Exod 14:14. לְ + infinitive can be used to communicate a deontic notion; see §39.11(3)(a)(i) in Van der Merwe *et al*. (2017:350). Many thanks to Prof. Van der Merwe for his input on this grammatical issue.

rhetorical strategy. This allusion then must play a role in understanding the passage, not just the verse(s) in which the allusion resides.[104]

*Reciprocation*. We read of numerous miraculous victories by YHWH throughout the HB/OT. The success in 2 Chr 20 is certainly another example. However, with the explicit connection to Exodus, we see in sharp contrast the response by the Israelites in Exod 14 and the people in 2 Chr 20. At the Red Sea, the people cry out to YHWH in fear but immediately express regret and complaint to their human leader. Unlike their forebears, Judah stands with their king in prayer as they collectively express their concern to God directly. In both stories, God delivers his people, but we see in 2 Chr 20 an example of a right response to fear. The Israelites' response in Exod 14 is then left as a negative example of fear that they allow to cloud their assessment of the circumstances and seems to lead to their complaining.

*Historical Implications*. The post-exilic Chronicler values not just the events of Israel's past but the telling of those stories as well. These stories of Israel's ancestors and YHWH's deliverance are not simply antiquated tales for the past. They are meant to encourage in his present time. If Jehoshaphat and Judah found comfort and saw victory at YHWH's hand just as Moses and Israel did at the Red Sea, then so can the post-exilic audience of Chronicles also hope for and expect deliverance from those who oppose God's people. Hicks summarizes this perspective well: "The God of the Exodus is the God of the Restoration as well. Just as God delivered his people from Egypt and from this invading army, so God delivered his people from Babylon and can yet deliver his people from Persia. The hope of Judah is Yahweh" (2001:386). Beentjes comments similarly: "The author of 2 Chronicles 20 has exploited the (written) traditions of Exodus 14 relating to

---

[104] Amzallag rightly observes many parallels between Exod 14 and 2 Chr 20 (2016:181-182) but does not allow those parallels to help him interpret the passage at large. He makes much of the connections between the two passages: "These parallels between Jehoshaphat and Moses transform the story of Jehoshaphat's war into one of the most significant events in the religious history of ancient Israel. For this reason, it should be considered as the climax of the laudation of Jehoshaphat in the book of Chronicles" (182). Unfortunately, he immediately allows a misunderstanding of 20:37 (or perhaps its significance) to sour his understanding of how the Chronicler presents Jehoshaphat. In the remaining two-thirds of his article, he writes of Exod 14 only twice in footnotes but does not communicate that Exod 14 influences his interpretation of 2 Chr 20. Amzallag writes: "However, the overall criticism against Jehoshaphat expressed in 2 Chron. 20:37 invites us to examine whether a subversive subliminal layer exists beyond this primary meaning in the story of Jehoshaphat's war" (182). He argues throughout the remainder of the article for this subliminal layer that is a subtle critique of Jehoshaphat and his conduct throughout this chapter. Amzallag wrongly identifies the criticism of Jehoshaphat as "overall". Jehoshaphat is criticized in 2 Chr 20:37, but the prophet's rationale for the criticism is clearly explained. YHWH will destroy the works of Jehoshaphat because he allied himself with Ahaziah, king of Israel (כִּֽהִתְחַבֶּ֥רְךָ עִם־אֲחַזְיָ֖הוּ). Amzallag does not mention this reason provided by Eliezer. Amzallag does not acknowledge in his article the positive statement in 20:30 ("And the kingdom of Jehoshaphat was quiet, and his God gave to him rest all around") nor the general positive assessment of Jehoshaphat in 20:32 ("And he walked in the way of his father Asa and did not turn aside from it, doing right in the eyes of YHWH").

Israel's fundamental experience at the Red Sea in order to encourage and activate the community of his own day" (1993:268).

### 3.2.5 – 2 Chr 21:14

Chronicles clearly portrays Jehoram as a wicked king of Judah. He follows the ways of his father-in-law, King Ahab of Israel. Jehoram experiences revolts because he forsakes the Lord. He makes high places for the worship of foreign gods and leads Judah in unfaithfulness away from God. As a result, Jehoram receives a letter of rebuke from Elijah the prophet, foretelling Jehoram's downfall.

*Marker Identification*. The word מַגֵּפָה ('plague', 'blow') is relatively infrequent in the HB/OT, occurring twenty-six times.[105] Even more infrequent is the appearance of מַגֵּפָה and בְּ + עַם + second masculine singular suffix ('against your people'). This combination of terms only appears three times in the HB/OT: Exod 9:14; 1 Chr 21:17; 2 Chr 21:14. In Exod 9:13-19, YHWH says to Moses what Moses is to say to Pharaoh, promising hail as the seventh plague because Pharaoh will not send away (שׁלח; 9:13, 17) God's people. In Exod 9:14, YHWH promises, through Moses, that he will send (שׁלח) a plague on Pharaoh and Pharaoh's servants and people.[106] In 1 Chr 21:17, King David pleads with God to relieve the judgment against the people of Israel because of David's sinful census. Elijah foretells in 2 Chr 21:14 that YHWH will strike Jehoram's people with a great plague. Additionally, we see the use of the verb נגף in Exod 7:27(8:2); 12:13, 23 (x2), 27 and 2 Chr 21:14, 18.[107] Conceptually, we also see a parallel between Exod 9:14 and 2 Chr 21:14. In both cases, YHWH promises to send a plague on the people of a disobedient king, and YHWH delivers the promise of the plague via a highly revered figure in Israel's history. This report about Elijah's letter is unique to 2 Chronicles, so the potential allusion is not taken from other sources.

---

[105] Exod 9:14; Num 14:37; 17:13, 14, 15; 25:8, 9, 18, 19; 31:16; 1 Sam 4:17; 6:4; 2 Sam 17:9; 18:7; 24:21, 25; 1 Chr 21:17, 22; 2 Chr 21:14; Ps 106:29, 30; Ezek 24:16; Zech 14:12, 15 (x2), 18. The phrase מַגֵּפָה גְּדוֹלָה ('a great plague') in 2 Chr 21:14 only appears elsewhere in 1 Sam 4:17. However, the use in 1 Sam 4:17 is in a military context (see 1 Sam 4:16) and does not appear to match the use or context in 2 Chr 21:14.

[106] Furthering the wordplay, in Exod 9:15, God speaks of how he could have reached out (שׁלח) his hand and struck Pharaoh. In Exod 9:19, God instructs Pharaoh to send out (שׁלח) to get livestock and servants to safety.

[107] This can only be a supporting argument as the verb נגף is used more frequently, appearing forty-nine times in the HB/OT.

*Coherence*. The coherence of 2 Chr 21:14 and Exod 9:14 aligns with the relative dating of 2 Chronicles and Exodus discussed above (see 1.3.3 and 3.1.1). The internal coherence seems to favor seeing 2 Chr 21:14 as the alluding text and Exod 9:14 as the evoked text. The word מַגֵּפָה is a bit unexpected in 2 Chr 21:14; though they are lexically related, מַגֵּפָה does not appear with verb נגף the other forty-eight times נגף occurs in the HB/OT.[108] In addition, the previous seven uses of the verb in Chronicles are either used intransitively or have people for the object.[109] If Japhet is correct that "your people" in 2 Chr 21:14 refers to Jehoram's family (1993:814), then the use of "your people" here instead of something like "your house" is conspicuous. Looking at Exod 9:14, even though מַגֵּפָה only appears once in Exodus, its use amid the well-known "Ten Plagues" narrative is not surprising. Additionally, because the hail plague impacts all Egyptians, it makes sense for Exod 9:14 to use "your people".

The external coherence of these two passages also seems to favor seeing 2 Chr 21:14 as the alluding text. In terms of characters, the two men who convey God's promise of a plague are both revered figures in the HB/OT. One could see a reference going in either direction. However, consideration of the passages' settings inclines us to see 2 Chronicles as alluding to Exodus. As noted, the occurrence of מַגֵּפָה in Exodus occurs amid the Ten Plagues narrative, a narrative whose influence can be seen throughout the remainder of the HB/OT. While the affliction suffered by Jehoram is perhaps well-remembered because of its terrible description (cf. 2 Chr 21:15, 18-19), it does not share the same status as the plagues against Egypt. It makes far more sense for the passage with the lesser-known affliction against a wicked Judean king to refer to the well-known passage about plagues against one of God's most iconic enemies in all the HB/OT.

*Use*. As Moses delivered YHWH's promise of an impending plague to Pharaoh, so Elijah delivered YHWH's promise of an impending plague to Jehoram. The specific nature of the plague is not described in detail in 2 Chr 21 as it is in Exod 9. The plague in 2 Chr 21:14 seems to refer to the coming attack from the Philistines and Arabians (21:17-18) and the resulting damage.[110] Hicks,

---

[108] נגף is used nine other times by the Chronicler, including seven occurrences prior to the one in 2 Chr 21:14: 1 Chr 19:16, 19; 2 Chr 6:24; 13:15, 20; 14:11; 20:22; 21:18; 25:22.

[109] The use of נגף in 2 Chr 25:22 is also intransitive. נגף in 2 Chr 21:18 is followed by the prepositional phrase לְחֳלִי ('with a sickness').

[110] There is a clear lexical connection between 2 Chr 21:14 and 21:17 with the repeated uses of 'all (your/his) property', 'sons', and 'wives'. Johnstone sees great significance in the threefold threat this plague is to Jehoram's people, dynasty, and Davidic prosperity (1997b:113-114).

citing Johnstone, highlights the use of the verb נגף in Exod 7:27(8:2) and the noun נֶגֶף in Exod 12:13: "God prosecutes a kind of 'negative exodus' as he curses Judah. God plagued Egypt (Exod 8:12; 12:13), and God will plague Judah (2 Chr 21:14,18)" (2001:397). Johnstone notes the irony, "God's great acts of deliverance are now thrown into reverse…" (1997b:113).[111] In addition, we see a comparison between the characters of Pharaoh and Jehoram, both of whom have acted in such a way to receive their respective plagues as a consequence. Before describing the seventh plague, Exod 9:12 explains that Pharaoh did not listen to Moses and Aaron (and YHWH hardened Pharaoh's heart). Exodus 9:17 also explains that Pharaoh continues to exalt himself and does not send away God's people.[112] Likewise, the threefold reason for the coming plague against Jehoram's people is found in the preceding verse (2 Chr 21:13).[113] With this comparison between the characters themselves, the Chronicler communicates that Jehoram's actions against God are as bad as Pharaoh's actions against God. Johnstone writes, "Jehoram himself has become like Pharaoh, the object of God's own punitive actions, and thus the cause of the ruin of his people…" (1997b:133).

*Recurrence*. As noted above, we observe the use of 'plague' and 'against your people' in 1 Chr 21:17 (וּבְעַמְּךָ לֹא לְמַגֵּפָה).[114] In 1 Chr 21:14, we see retribution for disobedience against God's commands. David labels this retribution (and the judgment he can see coming against Jerusalem) as "a plague against your [YHWH's] people" in his plea for mercy on Jerusalem. David connects his disobedience with the disobedience that brought the plagues upon Egypt. Just as God visited punishment on Pharaoh and his people for Pharaoh's refusal to listen to Moses and Aaron, so God

---

[111] Johnstone also notes a retributive irony in the consequences against Jehoram, "As he had eliminated his brothers, so he is now to lose his sons" (1997b:112). Related to that, there is also a narrative irony that the plague in 2 Chr 21:14, 17 leaves Jehoram his youngest son, while the final plague in the Exodus narrative takes Pharaoh's oldest son from the Egyptian king (Exod 12:29).

[112] Another reason for these events is mentioned in Exod 9:16: that God's power be displayed, and his name proclaimed.

[113] I.e., Jehoram (1) walked (הלך) in the way of the kings of Israel, (2) caused Judah to commit adultery (זנה), and (3) killed (הרג) his brothers. While the first two are bad enough on their own, the Chronicler seems to be emphasizing the atrocious nature of the third with the emphatic fronting of the direct object ( וְגַם אֶת־אַחֶיךָ בֵּית־אָבִיךָ הַטּוֹבִים מִמְּךָ הָרָגְתָּ) and his descriptive language (your brothers *of the house of your father, who were better than you*).

[114] There is a parallel account of this narrative in 2 Sam 24, and there are similarities between 1 Chr 21:17 and 2 Sam 24:17. However, the final phrase of 1 Chr 21:17, which contains the recurrent allusion to Exod 9:14, has been added by the Chronicler and is thus unique to him.

brings the pestilence on Israel for David's refusal to listen to Joab. God will punish sin severely when it is deserved, even against a beloved king and his people.[115]

Unlike the allusion in 2 Chr 21:14, however, an analogy between Pharaoh and David is not being made by the Chronicler in 1 Chr 21:17. A key contrast between the two characters is seen in that David evidences a repentant spirit (1 Chr 21:8, 16-17), takes ownership for his sinful census, pleading on behalf of Israel that they would no longer receive the judgment because of his sin, and follows through with his repentance (1 Chr 21:19-30).[116] Pharaoh, on the other hand, refused to learn from God's multiple rebukes and ultimately reneged on his agreement to send away the people of God. The text of 1 Chr 21 does not portray David as a Pharaoh-like leader.

*Holistic Interpretation*. The Chronicler uses allusions in 1 Chr 21:17 and 2 Chr 21:14 to the plagues of Egypt to show the severity of sin and its due consequences. There are inherent penalties when one disobeys the commands of God, and God will execute his justice regardless of the status (in human terms) of the perpetrator or how well the perpetrator has previously held to the commands of God. We also see in the Chronicler's allusions to the Exodus plagues an underlying comparison to the one whose actions brought about the plagues, Pharaoh. The Chronicler uses the comparison to Pharaoh for both analogy and contrast. Those who disobey God and refuse to change align themselves with one of the foremost enemies of God in the HB/OT. Those who disobey God but repent align themselves with the foremost king of the Israelite monarchy.

*Reciprocation*. Like the allusion evaluated in 3.2.1, the reader of the Exodus plague narratives may be inclined to see God's judgment as reserved for his enemies who dare defy him. However, the reader of the plague narratives who has Chronicles in mind will be reminded that God's judgment is not reserved only for his enemies, but also for those of his covenant people who defy him consistently (like Jehoram) or who disobey him in certain moments (like David). God's justice is not based on favoritism but impartiality.

---

[115] Hicks also sees a connection to the Exodus plagues narrative in 1 Chr 21:15. He comments, "Chronicles alludes to the Exodus slaying of the firstborn of Egypt. Both were plagues and both involved God's destroying (שׁחת, *šāḥath*) presence (Exod 12:23)" (2001:206). Hicks connects הַמַּשְׁחִית in Exod 12:23 with the three *Hiphil* uses of שׁחת in 1 Chr 21:15. We note also that the word דֶּבֶר ('pestilence'; 1 Chr 21:12, 14) occurs in the Pentateuch in Exod 5:3; 9:3, 15; Lev 26:25; Num 14:12; and Deut 28:21. The 'sword of YHWH' (חֶרֶב יְהוָה) is also equated with the pestilence (1 Chr 21:12); it is interesting that חֶרֶב appears in relatively close proximity to דֶּבֶר in Exod 5:3; Lev 26:25; and Deut 28:22. Further study is required to determine if and where the Chronicler may be alluding with the use of these terms.

[116] Regarding the sinfulness of the census and its due consequences, we recall Exod 30:12 and its use of נֶגֶף.

*Historical Implications*. With the question of chronology being addressed by others,[117] we concur with Japhet that a written prophecy condemning King Jehoram needed to come from a man of high reputation. She writes: "The renowned 'troubler of Israel' (1 Kings 18:17), zealously engaged in combating Baal worship in Ahab's realm, is also Jehoram's contemporary. The gravity of Jehoram's sins demands a prophetic figure of Elijah's caliber, and the Chronicler is not deterred by the geographical or political borders between the two kingdoms" (1993:812). This is especially true if the message was going to evoke images of Moses bringing promises of the plagues to the Egyptian king. What other prophet around this time could meet such requirements for reputation? It is fitting that the Chronicler's narrative specifies Elijah as the prophetic author. We see with his inclusion here (rather than anonymous prophetic attributions by the Chronicler found later in 2 Chr 24:19; 25:7, 9, 15, 16; 36:16) that the Chronicler (and thus the post-exilic community) held Elijah in high regard.

### 3.2.6 – 2 Chr 22:11

Athaliah is first introduced in Chronicles in 2 Chr 22:2. The Chronicler writes in 22:3 that she advises her son Ahaziah to do wickedness. The Chronicler attributes Ahaziah's short reign to his wickedness. Upon his death, his mother seeks to kill all the offspring of the house of Judah (22:10).[118] One boy is saved: Joash, the infant son of Ahaziah. The story of Joash begins in 2 Chr 22:11.

*Marker Identification*. The marker identification for this allusion is perhaps driven more by conceptual similarities, but there are lexical overlaps, including one rare Hebrew word. When considered together with the conceptual parallel, a potential allusion takes shape. Exodus 2 and 2 Chr 22 tell of the harrowing beginnings to the lives of Moses and King Joash, respectively. Conceptually, we have in both passages a female character hiding a baby so that the child may escape the death decreed for an entire group of boys at the hands of the royal figure in command.[119] This facility of safety even includes the provision of a nurse for the infant.

The most apparent lexical connection is the rare word מֵינֶקֶת ('a nurse'). Appearing six times in the HB/OT (Gen 24:59; 35:8; Exod 2:7; 2 Kgs 11:2; 2 Chr 22:11; Isa 49:23), the contexts of Exod 2; 2 Kgs 11; and 2 Chr 22, as well as the additional lexical links in those three passages,

---

[117] See, e.g., Knuteson (2005); Japhet (1993:812-813); Klein (2012:306-307); and Hicks (2001:396-397).

[118] For possible reasons for Athaliah's actions, see Branch (2004:541) and Klein (2012:321).

[119] Handy attributes the conceptual parallels between the stories of Joash's and Moses' rescues to both stories supposedly being written in the style of a certain type of story, namely "Tale of the Hero Exposed at Birth" (1988). However, with the presence of lexical connections between the two passages, this study sees the conceptual overlaps as additional indicators of a potential inner-biblical allusion rather than an appeal to an independent typology.

indicate potential connections between them. The significance of the parallel account in 2 Kgs 11 is discussed below; for now, we focus on the Exodus and 2 Chronicles connections. Furthering the connections between our passages in question are the more common words לָקַח (‘to take’; Exod 2:5, 9; 2 Chr 22:11); בַּת (‘daughter’; Exod 2:5, 7, 8, 9, 10; 2 Chr 22:11 [x2]; in each case, a daughter of royalty); and אָחוֹת (‘sister’; Exod 2:4, 7; 2 Chr 22:11).[120]

The parallel account and source of 2 Chr 22:11 is 2 Kgs 11:2 and includes the lexical markers noted above. However, the text of 2 Chr 22:11 shows ample evidence of reworking on the Chronicler’s part.[121] We understand this as the Chronicler taking ownership of the allusion and not merely copying the material from a source.

*Coherence*. The coherence of the passages indicates that 2 Chr 22 is the alluding text and Exod 2 the evoked text. Regarding the internal coherence, the individual words of the allusion are used in sensible fashions in both verses and do not inherently strike the reader as out of place. However, the familial connections of Jehoshabeath (including her being the ‘sister of Azariah’) are listed in an awkward position in the sentence in 2 Chr 22:11 (Klein, 2012:322). This inclines us to see the internal coherence slightly favor 2 Chr 22 as the alluding text. The external coherence is clearer regarding the direction of dependence. The story of Moses’ rescue from the water by the daughter of Pharaoh is much more well-known than the story of Joash’s hiding by Jehoshabeath. An author is much more likely to compare a lesser-known person and story to the well-known person than the reverse.

---

[120] The ‘daughter’ and ‘sister’ characters in Exod 2 are two separate characters but are the same character in 2 Chr 22. The use of ‘sister’ in Chr 22:11 is interesting given that the woman in question is the aunt of Joash. If the narrative is ultimately about the rescue of Joash, why would the Chronicler say that Jehoshabeath is the “sister of Ahaziah” rather than the aunt (דּוֹדָה) of Joash? דּוֹדָה is a rare word in the HB/OT (it appears only three times: Exod 6:20; Lev 18:14; 20:20), but the word was an option for the Chronicler. Possible reasons include: the Chronicler could be (1) using the language of ‘sister’ because that was the language used in 2 Kgs 11:2; (2) emphasizing Jehoshabeath’s relationship to the deceased son of the villain in the story; or perhaps (3) making the heroine of the story in 2 Chr 22 have the same status of ‘sister’ as Miriam in Exod 2. Because the phrase אֲחוֹת אֲחַזְיָהוּ (‘sister of Ahaziah’) is moved from near the beginning of the verse in 2 Kgs 11:2 to near the end of the verse in 2 Chr 22:11, thus showing intentional movement and use by the Chronicler, we do not see option (1) as likely.

[121] The evidence of considerable reworking by the Chronicler is as follows: multiple spelling changes; as noted in the previous footnote, the phrase אֲחוֹת אֲחַזְיָהוּ is found near the beginning of 2 Kgs 11:2 but is moved to near the end of 2 Chr 22:11; multiple words are omitted in 2 Chr 22:11; two individual words are added in 2 Chr 22:11; and a lengthy phrase of all new material is included near the end of 2 Chr 22:11. Cf. Klein (2012:321). Japhet says that the addition of the title “the wife of Jehoiada the priest” (אֵשֶׁת יְהוֹיָדָע הַכֹּהֵן) “focus[es] greater attention on the figure of Jehosheba/Jehoshabeath” (1993:828).

*Use*. On the surface, 2 Chr 22:11 shows a character defying a heinous ruler and the saving of a boy who will become the leader of his people. What is the focus of the verse (and the allusion within it): the defiance of Jehoshabeath and her similarity to the women in Exod 2, or the miraculous saving of the infant who would otherwise die (and thus Joash had beginnings just like Moses, establishing a parallel between Joash and Moses), or both? The surrounding context reveals that both foci are in view. The preceding context sets up a literary contrast between Athaliah and Jehoshabeath; the following verses indicate that the focus has shifted to Joash since Jehoshabeath is not mentioned again. A reader knows from 2 Chr 22:3 that Athaliah counseled her son Ahaziah to do wickedness, so anything she does from that point forward will be understood with a negative view of her character. The next time the reader sees Athaliah act is in 22:10. She orders the death of the royal line of Judah. Though the action itself is shocking, the reader is not necessarily surprised that she has done something evil. This characterization then puts the character of Jehoshabeath in stark contrast. By alluding to the rescue of Moses, the Chronicler is indicating that Jehoshabeath is acting like Miriam (and Pharaoh's daughter) and doing the right thing, just like those characters did in Exod 2. We see Jehoshabeath is in the right, even though she defies the royal action. Japhet sees this parallel and even sees conceptual parallels to the midwives as well (1993:828-829; cf. Klein, 2012:322). While Jehoshabeath's upright character is in view, we also see in 2 Chr 22:11 the introduction of the newest king of Judah, Joash. Jehoshabeath is no longer mentioned in Chronicles after this verse, but Joash's reign (and thus the downfall of Athaliah) has now become the focus of the remainder of the chapter and the following two chapters. Johnstone sees both foci as well, noting not only the multiple conceptual parallels between the rescuers of the infants in Exod 2 and 2 Chr 22 but also between Moses and (the line of) David. Johnstone sees in this narrative a continuation by the Chronicler of a typology taken from Kings between David and Moses. The infant rescued in this narrative, Joash, is the new Davidic king, and the typological connections are further developed by this Moses-like rescue (1997b:122).[122]

*Recurrence*. This study did not find additional allusions to Exod 2 by the Chronicler.

*Holistic Interpretation*. The allusion in 2 Chr 22:11 accomplishes multiple comparisons. As noted above, the primary foci of the verse and its allusion to Exod 2 highlight the excellent character of Jehoshabeath in her life-saving defiance and introduce the character of Joash and his miraculous beginnings. We also see an indirect negative comparison, a comparison we have seen before in Chronicles. If Jehoshabeath is Miriam and Pharaoh's daughter from Exod 2 and Joash is

[122] More is said below in 3.2.7 about Joash following the commands of Moses.

Moses, then Athaliah is Pharaoh. With this allusion, the Chronicler implicitly puts Athaliah into the category of villains who oppose God.

*Reciprocation*. The allusion in 2 Chr 22:11 provides the reader of Exod 2 another example of someone rightly defying an evil, royal decree. The reader of Exodus has already seen righteous defiance in Exod 1 by the Hebrew midwives. Now, in Exod 2, the reader sees Moses' family, and even the family of Pharaoh himself, defy the order of the Egyptian king. This righteous defiance extends beyond the book of Exodus and can be seen elsewhere in the HB/OT. Unfortunately, the example of 2 Chr 22 indicates to the reader of Exod 2 that wicked decrees will not always come from foreign monarchs but may come from Israel's own throne.

*Historical Implications*. This allusion is one of the more subtle ones assessed in this study. This subtlety demonstrates that the story of Moses' rescue as an infant in Exod 2 was known well enough by the Chronicler's audience that the author could elicit its recall with more subtle connections rather than more overt evocations.

### 3.2.7 – 2 Chr 24:6-12

King Joash begins to reign at seven years old. Rather than frame the king's life as right in the eyes of YHWH as had been in the case with Asa (2 Chr 14:1) and Jehoshaphat (2 Chr 20:32), 2 Chr 24:2 conspicuously frames King Joash's life as right in God's eyes only during Jehoiada's lifetime. Upon Jehoiada's death in 24:15, the reader anticipates a moral fall for King Joash. However, for our present study, we see King Joash oversee an excellent thing. In 2 Chr 24:4, the Chronicler introduces the narrative's topic through v. 14: the repair of the temple.

*Marker Identification*. In this context of repairing the Israelite place of worship, the Chronicler prepares the reader to think of passages elsewhere when he mentions in 2 Chr 24:6, 9 "the tax of Moses" (מַשְׂאַת מֹשֶׁה). This phrase only appears in 2 Chr 24:6, 9 in the HB/OT, and the word מַשְׂאֵת only appears in the Pentateuch in Gen 43:34 (three times, in a fashion unrelated to Moses). What then is the referent for this phrase in 2 Chr 24:6, 9? Through conceptual and lexical connections, the Chronicler appears to point the reader to Exod 30.[123] As just noted, the topic of 2

[123] Japhet argues that "The explicit context of the 'tent of the testimony' (*'ōhel ha'ēdūt*) refers us to the context of the wilderness, and the exacting of 'half a shekel … as an offering to the Lord' (Exod. 30:13)" (1993:844). Certainly, the tent of the testimony does point the reader to a wilderness context, but if anything, the phrase 'tent of the testimony' would not point us to Exod 30, but to Num 9:15; 17:22(7), 23(8); or 18:2, the only other places in the HB/OT where אֹהֶל הָעֵדוּת occurs. Schniedewind argues that the 2 Chr 24 "appeal to a tabernacle precedent has no close parallel in Exodus 30" and is instead related to Neh 10 (1999:168). However, Schniedewind does not seem to take the lexical connection in 2 Chr 24 to Exod 30 into account. The lexical connection in 2 Chr 24 to Exod 30 is discussed below.

Chr 24:4-14 is the repair of the temple; this includes the collecting of money from the people of Israel to pay for the repairs. Lexically, we see only four places in the HB/OT where the giving (נתן) of money/silver (כֶּסֶף) for the service (עֲבֹדָה) of a place of worship is mentioned: Exod 30:11-16; 1 Chr 29:7; 2 Chr 24:11-12; and 2 Chr 34:8-14.[124] In Exod 30:11-16, a monetary collection is commanded for the service of the tabernacle.[125] The money is to act as an atonement to cover the otherwise plague-inducing act of taking a census. Thus, Exod 30:16 begins, "And you shall take the atonement money from the sons of Israel and give it for the service of the tent of meeting…" (וְלָקַחְתָּ אֶת־כֶּסֶף הַכִּפֻּרִים מֵאֵת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְנָתַתָּ אֹתוֹ עַל־עֲבֹדַת אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד). In 2 Chr 24:12, the king and Jehoiada give (נתן) the collected funds (כֶּסֶף from v. 11) "to those doing the work of the service of the house of YHWH" (אֶל־עֹשֵׂה מְלֶאכֶת עֲבוֹדַת בֵּית־יְהוָה). The contexts of 1 Chr 29:7 and 2 Chr 34:8-14 concern the collection of funds and materials for the building of the temple and the temple's restoration, respectively. The lexical connections in 1 Chr 29:7 and 2 Chr 34:8-14 are discussed below in *Recurrence*. Building on the connection to Exod 30, some scholars note a connection between 2 Chr 24:6-12 and Exod 38:24-28 via the shared phrase in both Exod 30:13 and 38:26 (מַחֲצִית הַשֶּׁקֶל בְּשֶׁקֶל הַקֹּדֶשׁ "half a shekel by the shekel of the sanctuary') but do not specify a lexical overlap between Exod 38 and 2 Chr 24 directly (cf. Myers, 1965:137; Japhet, 1993:843-844; Thompson, 1994:314-315; Tuell, 2001:194; Klein, 2012:340-341).[126] This study focuses on the potential allusion to Exod 30.

---

[124] The terms נתן, כֶּסֶף, and עֲבֹדָה do also appear within two verses of each other in Exod 35:32-36:1; Lev 25:37-39; and 1 Chr 28:11-29:5. However, these passages do not relate to our present inquiry. Exodus 35:32-36:1 discusses the skill of Bezalel and Oholiab and their leading of the work on the tabernacle but does not mention the people providing the materials or money for that work. Leviticus 25:37-39 specifies how an Israelite is to treat a poor neighbor. First Chronicles 28:11-29:5 tells of King David giving the plans for the temple's construction to his son Solomon and of David's own contributions to the project (not the people's). Johnstone observes another lexical connection between Exod 30 and 2 Chr 24: two words in Exod 30:12 contain the same root as two words in 2 Chr 24:11 "(*p q d*)" (1997b:138). Johnstone then references the payment's purpose in Exod 30 (to avert a plague) and the improper census in 1 Chr 21, which also contains a word with the same root in 1 Chr 21:5. Aside from the lexical association, Johnstone does not explain the significance of the connection. Evans also sees a connection between 1 Chr 21 and Exod 30, but demonstrates that Johnstone's argument about the "(*p q d*)" connection is lacking (2013b:71-72).

[125] Stuart defines the 'service' here as "upkeep, general expenses, related to proper worship, the exact expenditures presumably determined according to the decision of the high priest at any time as he was sensitive to the leading of God" (2006:639).

[126] We understand the link between Exod 38 and 2 Chr 24 then mostly at a conceptual level, though כֶּסֶף ('silver' or 'money') and מְלָאכָה ('work') are in both passages. We hesitate to see too much significance in this lexical

The narrative in 2 Chr 24:6-12 does have a parallel in 2 Kgs 12, but the material in Chronicles is unique to the Chronicler, evidencing considerable reworking and multiple details not included in 2 Kgs 12. Scholars note links between 2 Kgs 12 and 2 Chr 24 (e.g., Japhet, 1993:843-844; Johnstone, 1997b:139-142; Hicks, 2001:411; Klein, 2012:340-342, esp. n. 35), but the viewpoint and details of 2 Chr 24:6-12 (and thus its allusion to Exodus) are the Chronicler's alone.

*Coherence*. Regarding internal coherence, the phrase connecting 2 Chr 24:12 and Exod 30:16 contains an elaboration in 2 Chr 24:12. This elaboration indicates 2 Chr 24 is the allusive text and Exod 30 the evoked text (cf. Carr, 2001:110). In Exod 30:16, the money is to be given for the service of the tent of meeting (וְנָתַתָּ אֹתוֹ עַל־עֲבֹדַת אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד). In 2 Chr 24:12, the money was given "to those doing the work of the service of the house of YHWH" ( אֶל־עֹושֵׂה מְלָאכֶת עֲבוֹדַת בֵּית־יְהוָה). In addition, the reference to the "tax of Moses" in 2 Chr 24:6, 9 indicates 2 Chr 24 is the alluding text. It would be strange to have this phrase appear (twice) in the evoked text. Lastly, regarding external coherence, it is more sensible for a context about the repair of the temple to refer to the example of the construction of the first house of worship for Israel's God rather than the construction of the tabernacle to allude to one of multiple temple repair projects discussed in Chronicles.

*Use*. The payments outlined in Exod 30 were to be used for the service of the tabernacle. The reference to Exod 30 in 2 Chr 24 applies such payments to the service of the temple. In this allusion, the Chronicler is demonstrating that the temple is the fulfillment of the tabernacle and that Joash is fulfilling the command of Moses in providing for its repair. Speaking of this connection between Chronicles and Exodus, Thompson writes, "Here, as in other places, the Chronicler draws a parallel between the tabernacle and the first temple, furthering his tabernacle-temple typology" (1994:315). Japhet likewise sees an "identification" between these structures and applying the laws about the tabernacle to the temple (1993:844; see also Evans, 2013b:74-75).

*Recurrence*. As noted above, we observe the Chronicler twice using this allusive language elsewhere in his narrative, 1 Chr 29:7 and 2 Chr 34:8-14. King David addresses the assembly in 1

---

connection because כֶּסֶף and מְלָאכָה appear together within two verses of each other in twenty passages: Exod 22:6-7(7-8); 31:3-5; 35:24, 29-35; 38:24-27; 1 Kgs 7:51; 2 Kgs 12:8-17(7-16); 22:4-9; 1 Chr 22:14-16; 28:13-29:7; 2 Chr 5:1; 16:2-5; 17:11-13; 24:11-14; 34:9-17; Ezra 2:69; 3:7-9; Neh 5:15-16; 7:69-71; Esth 3:9-11. Some of these passages do relate to contributions for the work of Israelite places of worship, but with the relatively high frequency in the HB/OT of each of these words (403 occurrences for כֶּסֶף; 167 occurrences for מְלָאכָה), we find this particular argument lacking strength.

Chr 29 and speaks about the upcoming construction of the temple.[127] David informs the audience of all he will personally contribute to the project. Verse 5 ends with David asking the congregation who will (likewise) offer freely in order to consecrate or ordain himself (לְמַלֵּאות יָדוֹ, 'to fill his hand') to YHWH.[128] This question makes the leaders' gifts in 1 Chr 29:6-8 have a sacred element. They are giving for the service of the temple just as the people of Israel first gave for the service of the tabernacle and, in so doing, set themselves apart for the God of the temple.

Before the relevant passage in 2 Chr 34, the reader is told that King Josiah has done well in God's sight and has acted like Moses in his reign (see 3.2.14).[129] Beginning in 2 Chr 34:8, the narrative shifts to Josiah's effort to "make strong the house of YHWH his God" ( לְחַזֵּק אֶת־בֵּית יְהוָה אֱלֹהָיו). The money (כֶּסֶף; 34:9, 14) previously collected for the temple is distributed (נתן; 34:9, 10 [x2], 11) to those supervising those doing the work of the service ( וּמְנַצְּחִים לְכֹל עֹשֵׂה מְלָאכָה לַעֲבוֹדָה וַעֲבוֹדָה; 34:13; a further elaboration of 24:12). Here, the contributions and the repair of the temple are associated with Josiah's cleansing of the land and the temple ( לְטַהֵר הָאָרֶץ וְהַבָּיִת; 34:8) and provide the underlying context for the finding (and following) of the book of the law (34:14ff.). Ultimately, the care for the temple is associated with further obedience and the king's soft heart and humility before God (34:27).

*Holistic Interpretation*. From the various allusions to the command in Exod 30 to give money for the service of the tabernacle, the Chronicler has equated the status of the temple with that of the tabernacle. The temple is portrayed as the valid successor to the tabernacle and exhorts the reader to hold the temple in the same high regard. Not only that, but through these allusions, care for the house of God is associated with righteous living and respect for the sanctity of God and his dwelling place, both high values from the Torah.

---

[127] The vast majority of 1 Chr 29 is material wholly unique to the Chronicler's account, including the verses in question here.

[128] The phrase is used elsewhere in the HB/OT to mean 'consecrate' or 'ordain', typically but not exclusively in the context of priests being prepared for their sacred service at a place of worship. The same phrase in Exod 29:9, 35; Num 3:3; 2 Chr 13:9 communicates the idea of priestly ordination. In Exod 32:29; 2 Chr 29:31; Ezek 43:26 the phrase also communicates consecration, just not related to priests. The phrase in 2 Kgs 9:24 refers to pulling back the string on an archery bow.

[129] The narrative in 2 Chr 34 does have a parallel account in 2 Kgs 22 but shows significant reworking by the Chronicler and additional material different from the Kings account. Cf. Klein (2012:499-502) and 3.2.14.

*Reciprocation*. The Exodus passage related to giving for the house of God, Exod 30:11-16, is sandwiched between instructions for building the altar of incense and the bronze basin, two items that only needed to be built once. So too, one might understand the census and subsequent tax to be a one-time occurrence when read in this literary context. The related passage in Exod 38:25-26 and its context (with its noted literary connection from the repeated use of the phrase מַחֲצִית הַשֶּׁקֶל בְּשֶׁקֶל הַקֹּדֶשׁ) even details a one-time occurrence of the accumulation of material and wealth for the initial constructions of the tabernacle. However, when the reader of Exod 30 thinks of the uses of that passage in Chronicles, the reader is reminded of the practical longevity of this Torah statute; it was a standing and perpetual command, not just for the initial construction of the place of God's worship. The maintenance (and restorations needed later in Israel's history) was ongoing, not punctiliar. As such, funds were needed throughout the life of God's dwelling place, not just at its beginning.

*Historical Implications*. These allusions extend beyond the times and narratives of David (1 Chr 29), Joash (2 Chr 24), and Josiah (2 Chr 34). Scholars recognize the Chronicler's application of previous laws to his own postexilic context as well (e.g., Japhet, 1993:844; Klein, 2012:340-343; Hicks, 2001:411-412). Regarding the allusion to Exod 30 in 2 Chr 24 (as well as two other passages in 2 Chronicles that allude elsewhere in the HB/OT; cf. 3.2.15 below), Schweitzer writes, "the Chronicler seems to be interpreting a text (not just a tradition) in the light of new historical situations (namely, permission to return to the land and the rebuilding of the temple)" (2011:41). Hicks builds upon the idea put forth by Japhet (and others) that the Chronicler is exegeting the older texts and applying them to the time of writing; this exegesis and application "fits the Chronicler's own situation as he seeks to reinforce the support of the temple in the post-exilic community" (2001:411).

### 3.2.8 – 2 Chr 26:16-21

King Uzziah's reign starts well. Second Chronicles 26:4 gives him great affirmation. However, as with King Joash in 2 Chr 24:2, 2 Chr 26:5 frames the king's obedience in terms of another's life and with qualification. The Chronicler proceeds then to enumerate in 2 Chr 26:6-15 the king's building projects, accumulation of equipment and technology, and military victories; some of the latter come specifically from God's help (26:7). Yet, these highpoints lead to pride and

ultimately to the king's downfall.[130] The next section of the narrative, 26:16-21, details how the king becomes cut off from his own people.

*Marker Identification*. The words קטר ('to make a sacrifice') and קְטֹרֶת ('incense') appear together in eleven verses in the HB/OT: Exod 30:7, 8; 40:27; Num 17:5(16:40); 1 Sam 2:28; 1 Chr 6:34(49); 2 Chr 2:3(4); 13:11; 26:16, 19; 29:7.[131] קְטֹרֶת is an object of קטר in all but one instance (1 Chr 6:34[49]). There are multiple conceptual connections to the Pentateuch in 2 Chr 26:16-21 (cf. Cranz, 2019:243-245), but we focus on the lexical markers that connect 2 Chr 26:16-21 to Exod 30:7-8; 40:27; and Num 17:5(16:40).[132] Exodus 30 contains instructions for the proper construction and use of certain equipment in the tabernacle. Exodus 40 describes the actual construction of the tabernacle. Numbers 17:1-5(16:36-40) details God's instructions to the priests after Korah and those in the rebellion with him were judged. Second Chronicles 26:16-21 narrates how Uzziah disobeyed by entering the temple to practice what only the priests were to do. The material in 2 Chr 26:16-21 does not have a parallel in Kings, so the material and potential allusion(s) are unique to the Chronicler.

The high amount of lexical overlap between 2 Chr 26:16-21; Exod 30:1-10; and Num 17:4-5(16:39-40) makes it difficult to isolate only one of these texts as the potential evoked text in 2 Chr 26:16-21. The lexical matches extend beyond the two noted terms above. We show below each verse with its surrounding verses to highlight the connections, which include the additional words, מִזְבַּח ('altar') and אַהֲרֹן ('Aaron').[133] Exodus 40:26-27 lacks a reference to Aaron, so we see the

---

[130] See Klein (2015:18) regarding Uzziah's name and the significance of the interplay between עזר ('to help') and מעל ('to act unfaithfully') in this passage.

[131] In each of these instances, the verb קטר is in the *Hiphil* stem.

[132] The vocabulary in 1 Sam 2:28 is indeed similar to the vocabulary in 2 Chr 26:16-21, but comes in the midst of a list of responsibilities and privileges associated with the priesthood. The context there is a rebuke directed at Eli the priest for his mismanagement of the priesthood and his scorn and lack of appreciation for the responsibilities he and his house have been given. Rather than an evaluation of the proper or improper burning of incense, it is a moral critique of his character and thus not directly pertinent to the discussion of this allusion. The other Chronicles references are discussed below in *Recurrence*.

[133] We observe other shared terms including כֹּהֵן ('priest'), בֵּן ('son'), and יְהוָה ('YHWH'). כֹּהֵן is especially significant in 2 Chr 26:16-21 with seven occurrences. However, given the singular use in Num 17:4(16:39) as part of Eleazar's appellation, it is difficult to determine if the Chronicler's seven uses of the term could be alluding to this singular use. בֵּן is used twice in 2 Chr 26:16-21, once to describe the character of the accompanying priests (בְּנֵי־חַיִל, 'sons of strength') in 26:17 and once to further identify the priests as "the sons of Aaron" (בְּנֵי־אַהֲרֹן) in 26:18. Exodus 30:1-10 does not have the term בֵּן. Numbers 17:5(16:40) uses the word once meaning the people of Israel (לִבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל,

lexical connection between 2 Chr 26:16-21 and Exod 30:1-10 as stronger than the one between 2 Chr 26 and Exod 40:26-27. However, Exod 40:26-27 is lexically connected to Exod 30:1-10 in multiple ways: the use of the verb קטר; the word מִזְבַּח and its noted adjective הַזָּהָב (‘gold’, cf. Exod 30:3); as well as the phrases לִפְנֵי הַפָּרֹכֶת (‘before the veil’) and קְטֹרֶת סַמִּים (‘spiced incense’). We focus on the potential allusion to Exod 30 and Num 17 in 2 Chr 26, though we recognize that there could be an implicit connection to Exod 40:26-27 as well. The connections are displayed further below.

Conceptually, scholars are right to associate Num 18:1-7 with 2 Chr 26:16-21 as well because of the passages’ shared subject matter (cf. Myers, 1965:150; Thompson, 1994:331; Hicks, 2001:430; Klein, 2012:379), but due to the lack of lexical links between Num 18:1-7 and 2 Chr 26:16-21, we do not discuss that passage further. There is a potential conceptual connection between the phrases מִזֶּרַע אַהֲרֹן (‘from the seed of Aaron’) in Num 17:5(16:40) and בְּנֵי־אַהֲרֹן (‘the sons of Aaron’) in 2 Chr 26:18. Both are used as delimiters for who is permitted to perform the incense offering.[134] However, the phrase “the seed of Aaron” or concept of “his/your [Aaron’s]

---

‘to/for the sons of Israel’). These uses do not seem to indicate a potential allusive connection. With the ubiquity of the name יְהוָה in the HB/OT, and its uses in Exod 30, Num 17, and 2 Chr 26 lacking shared phrases that include יְהוָה, it is difficult to affirm or deny that its four uses by the Chronicler were drawn from the potentially evoked texts in question.

We also observe a subtle but possible further connection between 2 Chr 26:16 and Exod 30:7; 40:27. In each case, the verb קטר and object קְטֹרֶת are separated by the preposition עַל (‘on’) and an object of the preposition; in Exod 30:7, the subject of the sentence (אַהֲרֹן) also separates the verb and object. In Exod 30:7 and 40:27, the object of the preposition is the third masculine singular suffix, עָלָיו, referring to the altar of incense (cf. Exod 30:1; 40:26). In 2 Chr 26:16, the prepositional phrase between the verb and object is עַל־מִזְבַּח (‘on the altar’). The shared structure is an intriguing similarity between the passages. The altar of incense has not yet been discussed in 2 Chr 26, so it is sensible that the Chronicler would use the noun instead of a suffix. Similarly, the referent (Uzziah) for the unspecified subject of the verb לְהַקְטִיר in 2 Chr 26:16 is supplied from 26:14 after a series of *wayyiqtol* constructions; it is sensible that the Chronicler would not supply the king’s name here matching the structure from Exod 30:7. Numbers 17:5 does not have this structure. Despite these intriguing arguments, we are not yet ready to argue for this as evidence of the Chronicler alluding to Exodus *instead* of Numbers in 2 Chr 26:16-21. It is common in Biblical Hebrew for shorter prepositional phrases to separate a verb and its other related constituents (cf. §46.1.3.1(1) in Van der Merwe *et al*., 2017:493-494). Were the grammatical structure in these passages uncommon, an argument for allusion based upon structure would increase in strength.

For these reasons, we conclude that these other shared terms and this structure do not assist in determining a single potential evoked text rather than multiple potential evoked texts.

[134] The use in Num 17:5(16:40) is used in the negative (אִישׁ זָר אֲשֶׁר לֹא מִזֶּרַע אַהֲרֹן הוּא; “a strange one who is not from the seed of Aaron”). The use in 2 Chr 26:18 is used in the positive (כִּי לַכֹּהֲנִים בְּנֵי־אַהֲרֹן; “but/only for the priests, the sons of Aaron”).

seed" occurs only five times in the HB/OT (Exod 28:43; Lev 21:17, 21; 22:4; Num 17:5[16:40]). The phrase "the sons of Aaron" alone occurs thirty-five times in the HB/OT, with eleven of those occurring in Chronicles.[135] Rather than use a rare phrase that would strongly indicate an allusion elsewhere, the Chronicler has used again in 2 Chr 26:18 a phrase known to his writing. We then understand that these phrases in Num 17:5(16:40) and 2 Chr 26:18 are not connected.

In addition to the potential allusion observed above, we also observe a separate lexical connection; this one is between 2 Chr 26:19-20 and Exod 28:36-38. The relatively rare word מֵצַח ('forehead') is used thirteen times in ten verses in the HB/OT.[136] Only the uses in Exod 28:38 and 2 Chr 26:19-20 appear in a priestly, worship context. Exodus 28 provides instruction for how the priests (and specifically the high priest) are to clothe themselves for service in the tabernacle.

[135] 1 Chr 6:35(50); 15:4; 23:28, 32; 24:1, 31; 2 Chr 13:9, 10; 26:18; 35:14 (x2).

[136] Exod 28:38 (x2); 1 Sam 17:49 (x2); 2 Chr 26:19, 20; Isa 48:4; Jer 3:3; Ezek 3:7, 8 (x2), 9; 9:4.

Exod 30:1, 6-9

1 וְעָשִׂיתָ מִזְבֵּחַ מִקְטַר קְטֹרֶת עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים תַּעֲשֶׂה אֹתוֹ׃

6 וְנָתַתָּה אֹתוֹ לִפְנֵי הַפָּרֹכֶת אֲשֶׁר עַל־אֲרֹן הָעֵדֻת

לִפְנֵי הַכַּפֹּרֶת אֲשֶׁר עַל־הָעֵדֻת אֲשֶׁר אִוָּעֵד לְךָ שָׁמָּה׃

7 וְהִקְטִיר עָלָיו אַהֲרֹן קְטֹרֶת סַמִּים בַּבֹּקֶר בַּבֹּקֶר בְּהֵיטִיבוֹ אֶת־הַנֵּרֹת יַקְטִירֶנָּה׃

8 וּבְהַעֲלֹת אַהֲרֹן אֶת־הַנֵּרֹת בֵּין הָעַרְבַּיִם יַקְטִירֶנָּה קְטֹרֶת תָּמִיד לִפְנֵי יְהוָה לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם׃

9 לֹא־תַעֲלוּ עָלָיו קְטֹרֶת זָרָה וְעֹלָה וּמִנְחָה וְנֵסֶךְ לֹא תִסְּכוּ עָלָיו׃

Exod 40:26-27

26 וַיָּשֶׂם אֶת־מִזְבַּח הַזָּהָב בְּאֹהֶל מוֹעֵד לִפְנֵי הַפָּרֹכֶת׃

27 וַיַּקְטֵר עָלָיו קְטֹרֶת סַמִּים כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֶת־מֹשֶׁה׃

Num 17:4-5

4 וַיִּקַּח אֶלְעָזָר הַכֹּהֵן אֵת מַחְתּוֹת הַנְּחֹשֶׁת אֲשֶׁר הִקְרִיבוּ הַשְּׂרֻפִים וַיְרַקְּעוּם צִפּוּי לַמִּזְבֵּחַ׃

5 זִכָּרוֹן לִבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִקְרַב אִישׁ זָר אֲשֶׁר לֹא מִזֶּרַע אַהֲרֹן הוּא

לְהַקְטִיר קְטֹרֶת לִפְנֵי יְהוָה וְלֹא־יִהְיֶה כְקֹרַח וְכַעֲדָתוֹ כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה בְּיַד־מֹשֶׁה לוֹ׃

2 Chr 26:16-19

16 וּכְחֶזְקָתוֹ גָּבַהּ לִבּוֹ עַד־לְהַשְׁחִית וַיִּמְעַל בַּיהוָה אֱלֹהָיו

וַיָּבֹא אֶל־הֵיכַל יְהוָה לְהַקְטִיר עַל־מִזְבַּח הַקְּטֹרֶת׃

17 וַיָּבֹא אַחֲרָיו עֲזַרְיָהוּ הַכֹּהֵן וְעִמּוֹ כֹּהֲנִים לַיהוָה שְׁמוֹנִים בְּנֵי־חָיִל׃

18 וַיַּעַמְדוּ עַל־עֻזִּיָּהוּ הַמֶּלֶךְ וַיֹּאמְרוּ לוֹ לֹא־לְךָ עֻזִּיָּהוּ לְהַקְטִיר לַיהוָה

כִּי לַכֹּהֲנִים בְּנֵי־אַהֲרֹן הַמְקֻדָּשִׁים לְהַקְטִיר צֵא מִן־הַמִּקְדָּשׁ כִּי מָעַלְתָּ וְלֹא־לְךָ לְכָבוֹד מֵיְהוָה אֱלֹהִים׃

19 וַיִּזְעַף עֻזִּיָּהוּ וּבְיָדוֹ מִקְטֶרֶת לְהַקְטִיר וּבְזַעְפּוֹ עִם־הַכֹּהֲנִים וְהַצָּרַעַת זָרְחָה בְמִצְחוֹ לִפְנֵי הַכֹּהֲנִים

בְּבֵית יְהוָה מֵעַל לְמִזְבַּח הַקְּטֹרֶת׃

*Coherence*. The coherence for each of the potential allusions above favors 2 Chronicles as the alluding text. Both potential allusions' internal and external coherences indicate 2 Chronicles to be the alluding text.

The internal coherence of 2 Chr 26:16-21 indicates it to be the alluding text in both potential allusions mentioned above. The narrative begins in v. 16 explaining the king's pride and that he acted unfaithfully to YHWH (וַיִּמְעַל בַּיהוָה אֱלֹהָיו). The king entering the temple to burn incense (וַיָּבֹא אֶל־הֵיכַל יְהוָה לְהַקְטִיר עַל־מִזְבַּח הַקְּטֹרֶת) immediately follows. Regardless of how we understand the connection between these clauses (whether causal, sequential, or providing an example), the verse implies that the reader is to know already that the king entering the temple for this reason is wrong. The priests make this clear by saying to King Uzziah in 26:18 that offering incense is not for the king to do but for the priests. This regulation (or at least, tradition or regular practice) must have been established sometime prior in order for them to make this claim. This makes it more likely that 2 Chr 26:16-21 is the alluding text.

Regarding the second potential allusion above, the location of the leprosy that appeared on Uzziah is unexpected as one reads 2 Chr 26:19. The Chronicler specifically calls attention to Uzziah having a censer *in his hand* (וּבְיָדוֹ מִקְטֶרֶת). The breakout of leprosy is unexpected in and of itself (cf. the priests' response in 2 Chr 26:20), but one would perhaps expect something negative to happen to the king's person near or on the body part the narrator has just specified. Instead, leprosy appears on the king's forehead. Such a development makes the reader wonder why leprosy appeared in that specific location. An allusion to another text could answer that question.

The external coherence of 2 Chr 26:16-21 leads the reader to see it as the alluding text in both potential allusions noted above. It makes more sense for 2 Chr 26:16-21 to allude to the regulations in Exod 30 and Num 17(16) as proof that what Uzziah was doing was wrong rather than Exod 30 and Num 17(16) alluding to the narrative of King Uzziah's entrance into the temple to establish prohibitive protocols. This is a similar logic to the external coherence of 2 Chr 16:14 noted above in 3.2.2. Regarding the term מֵצַח, if the use in Exod 28:38 alludes to 2 Chr 26:19-20, then the author of Exodus is providing a seemingly passive-aggressive assessment of King Uzziah in the establishment of regulations relating to the high priest's wardrobe. While possible, this does not seem plausible. Rather, if 2 Chr 26:19-20 alludes to Exod 28:38, leprosy breaking out on Uzziah's forehead is a reminder to the reader (and Uzziah) that the king is not the high priest, and thus he should not act like he is. The high priestly role was reserved solely for the one who would wear on his forehead the golden plate engraved with "Holy to YHWH".

*Use*. The allusions to Exod 28:36-38 and 30:1-10 in 2 Chr 26:16-21 provide both a negative evaluation of King Uzziah and a positive one of the temple and the priesthood. Uzziah's status is demoted in Chronicles because he did not respect the command of the Torah nor the holiness of God implicit in those commands. Despite his positive evaluation thus far in 2 Chr 26, the Chronicler paints him as presumptuous and disrespectful of God's "transcendent holiness. One does not enter God's presence with pride" (Hicks, 2001:340-341). The king who initially sought God is now guilty of disobedient unfaithfulness (מעל) because he transgressed the clear stipulations of Exod 30 and Num 17.[137] This allusive evaluation also elevates the status of the Temple and its priests. By the Chronicler's narration of Uzziah's prideful actions and resultant consequences, as well as the defense by the priests of their sacred role, the temple and priests are shown to be of utmost importance. The space where they work and their duties in that space are sacred and should be treated as such.[138] By alluding to Exod 30 and Num 17, the Chronicler gives the priests' claim in 26:18 the support of the Torah itself.

Likewise, the leprosy's location in 2 Chr 26:19-20 and its allusion to Exod 28:38 puts King Uzziah in his place through negative irony and, at the same time, elevates the role of the priesthood. The King had done well in 2 Chr 26 thus far, but his presumption to act as priest results in swift judgment. The leprosy's placement on his forehead emphasizes to him (and the reader of Chronicles) that even the king could not take on such a hallowed role. Commenting on the connection to Exod 28:36-38, Johnstone writes, "So far from the priestly pendant announcing that the requirements of the laws of holiness have been strictly observed and with a genuine intention, leprosy has broken out on Uzziah's brow as a statement of the total unacceptability of the king's burning of incense. Not only is it unacceptable; it is a pollution of the Temple…" (1997b:169). Hicks sees the same connection, "In contrast to the holiness that should pervade the Holy Place and in punishment of Uzziah's prideful assertion of priestly rights, the leprosy begins on his forehead. Where the high priest's pendant proclaims 'Holy to the Lord,' Uzziah's forehead says 'Unclean before the Lord'" (Hicks, 2001:432).

*Recurrence*. This study did not find other allusions by the Chronicler to Exod 28:36-38, but we see four other uses in Chronicles of the terminology from Exod 30:1-10 and Num 17:4-5(16:39-40).

---

[137] Regarding the use and significance of מעל in Chronicles, see Jonker (2017).

[138] Note the repeated references to the temple/house as well as the various verbs for going in and coming out of the temple in this narrative.

The first appearance of this terminology in Chronicles occurs in 1 Chr 6:34(49).[139] In the midst of a list of those appointed by David for service at the house of the Lord, the Chronicler introduces the sons of Aaron with a very brief summary of their duties. The Chronicler establishes that Aaron and his sons are the ones to make sacrifices on the altar of burnt offering and the altar of incense. The Chronicler ties these actions to the work of the Most Holy Place, to atonement for Israel, and to the commands of Moses, the servant of God.[140] While David set up much of the work of the tabernacle, it was Moses who set up the priests and their duties (Klein, 2006:207). With this allusion to Exod 30:1-10 and Num 17:4-5(16:39-40), the Chronicler establishes the proper operation of the priestly duties. Any variation from this then implicitly tarnishes and desecrates the Holy of Holies, creates an obstruction to the atonement of Israelite, and contradicts the commands of Moses, the servant of God, himself. Following the Torah is one of the major standards of faithfulness in Chronicles. This summation by the Chronicler is both a positive statement of how things should be and an implicit warning that any contradiction to these ideals and expectations is going to be received negatively.

The second use of this terminology occurs when King Solomon writes to Huram the king of Tyre beginning in 2 Chr 2:2(3) to ask for resources for the upcoming temple construction project. Solomon describes in 2 Chr 2:3(4) the cultic activities that will happen regularly once the construction is complete.[141] The sacrificing of incense (לְהַקְטִיר לְפָנָיו קְטֹרֶת־סַמִּים) is one of the activities. With this allusion to the incense offerings in Exod 30 and Num 17 (as well as other cultic allusions; cf. Japhet, 1993:539), the Chronicler further establishes what the regular cultic practices should (still) be and that the temple is like the tabernacle in that the function of the temple follows what Torah outlined for the tabernacle.

---

[139] "And Aaron and his sons were making sacrifices on the altar of burnt offering and on the altar of incense for all the work of the Holy of Holies…", וְאַהֲרֹן וּבָנָיו מַקְטִירִים עַל־מִזְבַּח הָעוֹלָה וְעַל־מִזְבַּח הַקְטֹרֶת לְכֹל מְלֶאכֶת קֹדֶשׁ הַקָּדָשִׁים. The material in 1 Chr 6:34(49) does not have a parallel in Samuel or Kings and is thus unique the Chronicler.

[140] The title here is significant; it is a title reserved for Moses (see also 2 Chr 24:9; Neh 10:30[29]; Dan 9:11). It reinforces Moses' authoritative status and could also indicate his prophetic status (Klein, 2006:208; cf. Amos 3:7). Cf. the many other uses of the phrase "servant of YHWH" (עֶבֶד־יְהוָה) in reference to Moses (Deut 34:5; Josh 1:1, 13, 15; 8:31, 33; 11:12; 12:6 [x2]; 13:8; 14:7; 18:7; 22:2, 4, 5; 2 Kgs 18:12; 2 Chr 1:3; 24:6) and Joshua (Josh 24:29; Judg 2:8).

[141] The author of Kings also includes a letter from Solomon to the king of Tyre requesting resources (1 Kgs 5:16-20[2-6]), but this list of cultic activities in 2 Chr 2:3(2) is unique to the Chronicler. Cf. Klein (2012:33); Japhet (1993:540).

The third use comes in 2 Chr 13:11.[142] In 2 Chr 13:4-12, King Abijah of Judah gives a speech against King Jeroboam of Israel and Jeroboam's false religion and priests. Abijah supports his claim of fealty and fidelity to God and God's Torah by using the language of Exod 30:1-10 and Num 17:4-5(16:39-40) (and elsewhere in the Pentateuch) in his description of his priests' activities.[143] Since Jeroboam's priests do not act like Abijah's who follow the law, Jeroboam's are not true priests. Abijah claims he and his priests keep the charge of the Lord, but Jeroboam and his priests have abandoned God.[144] Through Abijah's speech, the Chronicler argues for the faithfulness of those who follow the law (like Abijah) and the unfaithfulness of those who do not (like Jeroboam). The allusion here to Exod 30:1-10 and Num 17:4-5(16:39-40) provides a metric by which one can evaluate moral character.

The last use of this allusive language occurs in 2 Chr 29:7.[145] Speaking to the priests and Levites, King Hezekiah rightly notes the unfaithfulness of their ancestors. Part of that unfaithfulness was the previous priests not performing their daily functions. One of the listed (abandoned) duties was offering incense (וּקְטֹרֶת לֹא הִקְטִירוּ).[146] Here was an essential part of the life of the tabernacle and temple that Israel had not been doing.[147] Hezekiah wants to reverse course and follow the Torah. He correctly assesses that the unfaithfulness to and disobedience of the Torah led to God's wrath (29:8). Through Hezekiah's speech, the Chronicler associates disobedience of the Torah with God's wrath, shows Hezekiah as faithful because he wants to adhere to the Torah, and implicitly highlights the equal status of the tabernacle and temple.

---

[142] "And sacrificing to YHWH burnt offerings morning by morning and evening by evening and spiced incense", וּמַקְטִרִים לַיהוָה עֹלוֹת בַּבֹּקֶר־בַּבֹּקֶר וּבָעֶרֶב־בָּעֶרֶב וּקְטֹרֶת־סַמִּים. The material in 2 Chr 13:11 does not have a parallel in Kings and is thus unique to the Chronicler.

[143] Cf. Klein (2012:203). Regarding the language from elsewhere in the Pentateuch, Klein does mention other passages in Exodus. Those other Exodus passages do have strong conceptual ties to each activity mentioned in 2 Chr 13:11 but not strong lexical connections. Thus, we focus on the strongest lexical connections tied to our passages under consideration here (Exod 30:1-10; Num 17:4-5[16:39-40]).

[144] Note the marked word order of both the positive (כִּי־שֹׁמְרִים אֲנַחְנוּ אֶת־מִשְׁמֶרֶת יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ, 'for we are keeping the charge of YHWH our God') and negative (וְאַתֶּם עֲזַבְתֶּם אֹתוֹ, 'but you have abandoned him') statements at the end of 2 Chr 13:11 further emphasizing the contrast between those who are faithful and those who are not.

[145] The material in 2 Chr 29:7 does not have a parallel in Kings and is thus unique to the Chronicler.

[146] There is another lexical connection with the use of וַיְכַבּוּ אֶת־הַנֵּרוֹת ('And they extinguished the lamps') in 2 Chr 29:7 and בְּהֵיטִיבוֹ אֶת־הַנֵּרֹת ('when he dresses the lamps') in Exod 30:7.

[147] Note how Hezekiah labels the temple in 2 Chr 29:6-7: "the dwelling place of YHWH" (מִמִּשְׁכַּן יְהוָה, 29:6) and "the holy place of the God of Israel" (בַּקֹּדֶשׁ לֵאלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, 29:7). He does not use simpler appellations such as "the temple". The sacredness of the place is highlighted in these labels.

*Holistic Interpretation*. The Chronicler uses the recurrent allusion to Exod 30:1-10 and Num 17:4-5(16:39-40) and the allusion to Exod 28:38 to support multiple arguments. The tabernacle and temple are equated, and aspects of the temple's regular functions are highlighted as important, including especially the status and role of the priests (including the high priest). Faithful followers of God respect and obey the Torah. The Chronicler uses this obedience and respect of the Torah as a metric to demonstrate the faithfulness (or lack thereof) of his characters.

*Reciprocation*. The reader of Exod 28:36-38 and 30:1-10 sees temporal words and phrases like תָּמִיד ('continually', 28:38) and לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם ('throughout your generations', 30:8, 10). With all that transpires in the Israelite history recorded in the HB/OT, phrases such as these may seem hyperbolic. However, when one reads these passages in Exodus with Uzziah's narrative in Chronicles in mind, the reader is reminded that this command for longevity is not exaggerated but to be taken at face value. The holiness that God expected in the time of the tabernacle is the same holiness he expected at the time of the temple.

*Historical Implications*. Such a story with its allusions to Exodus (and Numbers) exhorts the post-exilic audience to take the sanctuary's holiness and its God seriously, just as the Torah commanded and not as King Uzziah did. Cranz summarizes the Chronicler's understanding this way: "The Chronicler is the first ancient author to step in by interpreting Uzziah's disorder as the result of sacrilege. The Chronistic account of Uzziah's צרעת is motivated by the Chronicler's concern with the temple cult…" (2019:248). This respect for the duties and items of their sacred cultic space was not just for the time of the tabernacle, nor just for the time of the temple. This need for respect of that which is holy carries on for the author of Chronicles and his own audience.

### 3.2.9 – 2 Chr 27:2

The reign of King Jotham is very positive yet only covers the nine verses of 2 Chr 27. He does well in God's sight and does not commit the grievous sin his father Uzziah did. However, his people are not obedient like he is.

*Marker Identification*. The words עַם ('people') and שׁחת ('destroy, act corruptly') only appear together as the subject and main verb in five verses in the HB/OT: Exod 32:7; Deut 9:12; 2 Sam 20:15; 2 Chr 27:2; Dan 9:26.[148] We see a lexical connection between Exod 32:7; Deut 9:12;

[148] The words appear together in fourteen verses in total (Exod 32:7; Num 32:15; Deut 9:12, 26; 1 Sam 26:15; 2 Sam 20:15; 24:16; 2 Chr 24:23; 27:2; Isa 1:4; 14:20; Ezek 30:11; Dan 8:24; 9:26). עַם is the object of שׁחת in four:

and 2 Chr 27:2 because the verb's use in each is reflexive.[149] The shared contexts of Exod 32; Deut 9; 2 Chr 27 of a faithful leader amidst a disobedient people also incline us to see a connection between them.[150] With these shared lexical and contextual connections, it appears the connections between 2 Chr 27:2; Exod 32:7; and Deut 9:12 are equal.[151] There is nothing apparent in either of the latter passages that indicates one is the only text connected to 2 Chr 27:2. In a similar fashion as 3.2.8 above, we understand both pentateuchal texts as connected to 2 Chr 27:2. This potential allusion is unique to the Chronicler.[152]

---

Num 32:15; Deut 9:26; 2 Chr 24:23; Dan 8:24. In two verses (1 Sam 26:15; Ezek 30:11), עַם is the subject, or part of the subject, of the main verb, but שׁחת is an infinitive of purpose rather than the main verb. The words appear together in three verses (2 Sam 24:16; Isa 1:4; 14:20) but are not syntactically related. It would perhaps be tempting to see a connection between 2 Chr 27:2 and Isa 1:4 because the form of the verb is the same (מַשְׁחִיתִים), but the use of a phrase is considered a stronger lexical connection than a single word (cf. Leonard's fourth principle [2008:246, 252-253]; see 2.3.1 above). Also, the shared contexts of Exod 32; Deut 9; and 2 Chr 27 of a faithful leader amidst a disobedient people incline this study to see a connection between those passages rather than Isa 1, which contends the whole nation is disobedient (cf. Leonard's sixth principle [2008:246, 255]; see 2.3.1 above). Johnstone sees a connection to "'the destroyer' of the Passover narrative" but does not seem to take into account the verb's subject עַם in 2 Chr 27:2 (1997b:172).

[149] The use in 2 Sam 20:15 is a masculine plural *Hiphil* participle like the use in 2 Chr 27:2; however, the use in 2 Sam 20:15 is intransitive (followed by an infinitive of purpose) rather than reflexive. The use in Dan 9:26 is transitive with a fronted compound object (וְהָעִיר וְהַקֹּדֶשׁ).

[150] The shared contextual connections, in addition to the lexical connections, incline us to include 2 Chr 27:2 in this study. Japhet contends the corrupt practices (מַשְׁחִיתִים) mentioned in 2 Chr 27:2 are "a textual 'remnant'" of the Chronicler matching the structure of 2 Kgs 15:35 (including three terms) and have "no literary or theological consequences", saying the connections "can be explained only in light of this [structural and lexical] editing" (1993:891). We also recognize the parallels between 2 Kings and 2 Chronicles here (see the following footnote), but disagree with Japhet. We understand the Chronicler's diversions from source texts as intentional and deliberate. Klein recognizes the structural and lexical overlap as well but suggests the Chronicler has departed from the author of Kings to contrast Jotham from his father Uzziah and to compare the people to King Uzziah and to strengthen a theme being developed by the Chronicler (2012:386; cf. Hicks, 2001:433-435). We discuss this further below in *Use* and *Holistic Interpretation*.

[151] This textual triad is different from the connections between 2 Chr 14:2(3); Exod 34:13; and Deut 7:5 noted above in 3.1.2.4. In that case, there was evidence of a stronger connection between 2 Chr 14:2(3) and Deut 7:5 than between 2 Chr 14:2(3) and Exod 34:13. There was also evidence of a further allusive relationship between Deut 7:5 and Exod 34:13 that helped to indicate Deut 7:5 as an intermediate source. Here, no such indicators of stronger connections to one passage or another exist between 2 Chr 27 and the other texts; the links connecting 2 Chr 27:2 to Exod 32:7 and Deut 9:12 appear equal. There are several strong lexical ties between Deut 9:12 and Exod 32:7-8 that indicate a connection between those passages independent of 2 Chr 27:2, but without an indication of a stronger connection between 2 Chr 27:2 and the pentateuchal texts, we argue the potential allusion in 2 Chr 27:2 is to them both.

[152] The key verbal phrase in the lexical connection under investigation here is unique to the Chronicler. There is a parallel account of Jotham's reign in 2 Kgs 15:32-38. Almost all the material in 2 Kgs 15:33 and 2 Chr 27:1 is identical. Much of 2 Kgs 15:34 and the first half of 2 Chr 27:2 are the same, but the second half of 2 Chr 27:2 is a reworking of the source text by the Chronicler (רַק לֹא־בָא אֶל־הֵיכַל יְהוָה וְעוֹד הָעָם מַשְׁחִיתִים). There is a conceptual connection and a few lexical connections between the second half of 2 Chr 27:2 and 2 Kgs 15:35 (רַק, עוֹד, and הָעָם

*Coherence*. Regarding internal coherence, the texts themselves seem to indicate 2 Chr 27:2 is the alluding text. Nothing in the vocabulary or syntax of Exod 32:7 looks out of place; the same is true of Deut 9:12. However, the use of מַשְׁחִיתִים in 2 Chr 27:2 is perhaps surprising to the reader if the reader was expecting further similarity to the source text from 2 Kgs 15:35.[153] The Chronicler perhaps uses the participle form of שׁחת to match the participle form of זבח in his source text, but the replacement of the verb alerts the reader that 2 Chr 27:2 may be alluding elsewhere.

The external coherence of Exod 32:7; Deut 9:12; and 2 Chr 27:2 indicates the latter to be the alluding text, and the former two the evoked texts. Like other passages connected to episodes in Exodus about Moses or Israel's time at Mount Sinai, the external coherence here makes more sense for Chronicles to allude to an infamous time in Israel's early history rather than Exodus and Deuteronomy to allude to the reign of a good but little-mentioned king of Judah.[154]

*Use*. The Chronicler morally evaluates both King Jotham and the king's people in 2 Chr 27:2. The Chronicler contrasts King Uzziah in 26:16 and Uzziah's son Jotham in 2 Chr 27:2 (Klein, 2012:386; Hicks, 2001:434). Uzziah entered the temple of YHWH (וַיָּבֹא אֶל־הֵיכַל יְהוָה, 26:16), but his son Jotham did not (רַק לֹא־בָא אֶל־הֵיכַל יְהוָה, 27:2).[155] Likewise, the Chronicler compares the people to King Uzziah. Uzziah's lifted heart about his strength led to his own destruction ( וּכְחֶזְקָתוֹ גָּבַהּ לִבּוֹ עַד־לְהַשְׁחִית, 26:16), and unlike King Jotham, the people acted corruptly ( וְעוֹד הָעָם מַשְׁחִיתִים, 27:2). This may be the extent the Chronicler intended for his lexical choices in 2 Chr 27:2. However, because of the lexical connections to Exod 32:7 and Deut 9:12 and especially the contextual connections with the narratives of Exod 32 and Deut 9, we see here an allusion to the episode of Israel making their own image for worship while Moses was atop Mount Sinai. In both

---

appear in 2 Kgs 15:35), but the remainder of the conceptually parallel content is different (cf. Klein, 2012:386). The second half of 2 Kgs 15:35 is matched in the first half of 2 Chr 27:3.

[153] See the previous two notes for observations regarding the structural and lexical parallels between the passages.

| | |
|---|---|
| רַק הַבָּמוֹת לֹא סָרוּ עוֹד הָעָם מְזַבְּחִים וּמְקַטְּרִים בַּבָּמוֹת | 2 Kgs 15:35a |
| רַק לֹא־בָא אֶל־הֵיכַל יְהוָה וְעוֹד הָעָם מַשְׁחִיתִים | 2 Chr 27:2b |

[154] Jotham's reign in Chronicles is covered in nine verses total (27:1-9) with two mentions in 26:21, 23.

[155] We agree with Hicks (2001:434-435); Klein (2012:386); and Jonker (2013a:258) who see a positive evaluation of Jotham or a negative evaluation of Uzziah in the Chronicler's note that Jotham did not enter the temple. The lexical connections in 2 Chr 27:2 to 26:16 argue against Johnstone's contention that Jotham not entering the temple is a negative evaluation by the Chronicler (1997b:171).

those pentateuchal texts and here in 2 Chr 27, the leader of the people of God is noted as faithful and the people corrupt. The people's disobedience does not reflect poorly on the leader but highlights his own character through sharp contrast (cf. Exod 32:10 and Deut 9:14). The Chronicler strengthens his moral evaluations, his commendation of Jotham and the condemnation of the people of Jotham's time, by alluding to the heinous actions of the people of Israel in Exodus and Deuteronomy. The people under King Jotham are like the wilderness generation who rebelled at Sinai, which then implicitly compares Jotham to Moses.

*Recurrence*. We see further connections to Exod 32 later in Chronicles (cf. 3.2.10, 3.2.12, 3.2.14), but we do not observe additional connections in Chronicles to the language or concepts of Exod 32:7.

*Holistic Interpretation*. The allusion to Israel's transgression at Sinai enhances the Chronicler's theme of individual responsibility. The structure of the Chronicler's narrative before, in, and after 2 Chr 27 highlights that a leader or a people need not follow the sin that has happened before, nor is a positive leader or people a guarantee of continued obedience (Hicks, 2001:433-434). Hicks writes: "Each person is responsible for their own wickedness and righteousness, and each community is responsible for its orientation to seek or forsake God" (2001:434).[156] By alluding to Exod 32:7 and Deut 9:12, the Chronicler reinforces the idea of individual responsibility. Just as Moses was not held responsible for Israel's sin, Jotham is not negatively evaluated because of his people's sin.

*Reciprocation*. There is a strong juxtaposition of Moses and the people in Exod 32 and Deut 9. The people have sinned so grievously that YHWH distances himself from them by telling Moses that *your* people whom *you* brought up from Egypt have acted corruptly (Exod 32:7; Deut 9:12). How can a leader be so good and the leader's people so bad? Will this difference in moral character and quality be a one-time issue or a constant struggle? If readers of these pentateuchal texts have 2 Chr 27 in mind, then they can see that this issue did not stop with Moses and the wilderness generation but continued throughout the nation's history.

*Historical Implications*. By alluding to the wilderness generation's corrupt conduct at the base of Mount Sinai, the Chronicler has reinforced his moral evaluations of the text's characters as well as the theme of individual responsibility. An audience recently returned from exile benefits from hearing these examples. Regarding the juxtaposition of Jotham and his people in 2 Chr 27:2, Hicks observes: "The postexilic community needs the hope of blessing following punishment, and they

---

[156] Hicks (2001:433-434), quoting Selman, and Jonker (2013a:259) highlight a potential connection to the concept of individual responsibility present in Ezek 18.

need the warning that evil can follow righteousness" (2001:433). For a people returning or returned from the exilic punishment of their God, the examples of Jotham and his people speak directly to their situation. How will they respond, like Jotham (and Moses) or like their ancestors who acted corruptly?

### 3.2.10 – 2 Chr 28:19

The Chronicler portrays Ahaz as the worst of the kings of Judah (Klein, 2012:407, 408; Jonker, 2013a:265). Ahaz commits many sins (including the worship of foreign gods), leads his people astray, and enlists the help of foreign nations. Second Chronicles 28 has nothing positive to say about him or his reign and leaves him buried in dishonor (Japhet, 1993:909).

*Marker Identification*. The uncommon verb פרע ('to let go/loose') appears sixteen times in fifteen verses in the HB/OT.[157] In four of those, it means "to act wildly or without restraint": Exod 32:25 (x2); 2 Chr 28:19; and Prov 29:18.[158] The uses in Exod 32:25 indicate the people of Israel were out of control and that Aaron was responsible for letting them be out of control. The use in 2 Chr 28:19 designates King Ahaz as the responsible party for Judah's wildness and unfaithfulness. The use in Prov 29:18 does not tell of a specific incident of depravity but rather is a statement of general principle about what causes wild, sinful behavior. The shared contexts of Exod 32:25 and 2 Chr 28:19, along with the lexical connection, point to an allusive relationship between the texts.

One may note additional lexical connections in 2 Chr 28 to Exod 32; the verb עשׂה ('to do/make') and its object מַסֵּכָה ('molten image) in 2 Chr 28:2 and חָרוֹן אַף ('burning anger') in 28:11, 13. However, there is insufficient evidence to argue that these connections are allusions to Exod 32.[159]

---

[157] Exod 5:4; 32:25 (x2); Lev 10:6; 13:45; 21:10; Num 5:18; Judg 5:2; 2 Chr 28:19; Prov 1:25; 4:15; 8:33; 13:18; 15:32; 29:18; Ezek 24:14.

[158] Some scholars note especially the use of פרע in Exod 5:4 because it (along with 2 Chr 28:19) is in the *Hiphil* (cf. Japhet, 1993:906; Johnstone, 1997b:186). However, the context and use there is very different than the use in 2 Chr 28:19. In Exod 5:4, Pharaoh is accusing Moses and Aaron of causing the people of Israel to abandon their harsh labor under slavery. The uses in Lev 10:6; 13:45; 21:10; and Num 5:18 relate to hair being let loose or hanging down. The verb in Judg 5:2 speaks of the act of leading (see BDB and *HALOT*). The other uses in Proverbs speak of avoiding or neglecting things (the wicked path, wise advice, or discipline). The use in Ezek 24:14 speaks of relenting.

[159] The verb עשׂה ('to do/make') and its object מַסֵּכָה ('molten image) appear together in fourteen verses in the HB/OT: Exod 32:4, 8; 34:17; Lev 19:4; Deut 9:12, 16; 27:15; Judg 17:3, 4; 1 Kgs 14:9; 2 Kgs 17:16; 2 Chr 28:2; Neh 9:18; Hos 13:2. The words appear together in five additional verses (Judg 18:14, 18; Ps 106:19; Isa 30:1; Hab 2:18) but do not have מַסֵּכָה as the object of the verb עשׂה. Thus, these latter five verses are not relevant here. There is not

There is a parallel account about King Ahaz in 2 Kgs 16, but as Smelik has written: "We have seen that the Chronicler did not merely adapt 2 Kgs 16 but that he almost completely rewrote the chapter while introducing many new elements and even a full new story" (1998:174; cf. Evans, 2013b:143-144). The potentially allusive language to Exod 32 is unique to the Chronicler's narrative.

*Coherence*. The internal and external coherence indicates a direction of dependence in which Chronicles alludes to Exodus. Internally, the grammar and syntax of Exod 32:25 read as one would expect of a biblical Hebrew narrative.[160] However, the grammar and syntax of the potentially allusive phrase in 2 Chr 28:19 strike the reader as unexpected. The phrase כִּי הִפְרִיעַ בִּיהוּדָה either

---

enough evidence in 2 Chr 28:2 and the possibly connected passages to indicate which passage(s) could be in view for the terms in 2 Chr 28:2. If one considers the terminology in 2 Chr 28:3 (the terms גּוֹי ['nations', in the plural] and ירשׁ ['to cause to possess/dispossess', in the *Hiphil* stem]) in conjunction with the terminology from 28:2, the field of potential connections narrows to Exod 34:17-24; Deut 9:4-12; 2 Kgs 17:8-16. Cf. Klein (2012:396) and Johnstone (1997b:176), who note Ahaz's actions in 2 Chr 28:2 contradict the law of God in Exod 34:17. However, the phrasing in 2 Chr 28:3 that includes these latter two terms is taken almost verbatim from 2 Kgs 16:3, thus negating the argument. We are left then with insufficient evidence to narrow down the evoked text(s) based on the usage of these terms.

The phrase אַף חָרוֹן occurs in thirty-three verses in the HB/OT: Exod 32:12; Num 25:4; 32:14; Deut 13:18; Josh 7:26; 1 Sam 28:18; 2 Kgs 23:26; 2 Chr 28:11, 13; 29:10; 30:8; Ezra 10:14; Job 20:23; Ps 69:25; 78:49; 85:4; Isa 13:9; 13:13; Jer 4:8, 26; 12:13; 25:37, 38; 30:24; 49:37; 51:45; Lam 1:12; 4:11; Hos 11:9; Jon 3:9; Nah 1:6; Zeph 2:2; 3:8. In 2 Chr 28:9-11, the prophet Oded speaks to the men of Israel, accusing them of their own sin and reminding them that they would invoke the burning anger of YHWH (חֲרוֹן אַף־יְהוָה) if they carried through with making slaves out of the captured Judahites. Leaders from Israel acknowledge in 28:13 that the fierce anger of God is against Israel ( וַחֲרוֹן אָף עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל). The phrase חֲרוֹן אַף־יְהוָה appears only seven times in the HB/OT (Num 25:4; 32:14; 2 Chr 28:11; Jer 4:8; 25:37; 30:24; Zeph 2:2) and thus would not initially incline the reader of 2 Chr 28:11 to think of Exod 32 for a lexical connection. However, because the Chronicler alludes to Exod 32 later in the account of Ahaz's reign, a reader may be right in wondering if the use of this phrase is an additional allusion to Exod 32. Yet, an intentional allusion seems less likely since the contexts do not align. The burning anger of YHWH in Exod 32:12 (which Moses is attempting to abate) is a result of Israel's disobedient actions in the worship of an idol. Here in 2 Chr 28:11, 13, the burning anger of YHWH is a result of the rage in which Israel killed Judah and the intention of Israel to enslave their Judahite brothers. If this is indeed an allusion to Exod 32:12, then the Chronicler is providing another moral evaluation with an allusion to Exod 32. Israel in 2 Chr 28 is acting sinfully like Israel did in Exod 32. The resultant response is a surprising contrast to Ahaz. The king of Judah is wicked while the people of Israel (who are understood in the text to be wicked as well; cf. 2 Chr 28:2 and the ways of the kings of Israel) respond to the word of the God through his prophet. Nevertheless, we cannot argue strongly for an allusion to Exod 32 without more evidence to support the claim.

[160] וַיַּרְא מֹשֶׁה אֶת־הָעָם כִּי פָרֻעַ הוּא כִּי־פְרָעֹה אַהֲרֹן לְשִׁמְצָה בְּקָמֵיהֶם. Each verbal clause is in typical Verb-Subject (-Object) word order. Both כִּי clauses are typical; the first is a clause of content, and the second a clause of explanation. Both conjugations of פרע are understandable with their contexts.

lacks a clear object or uses בְּ to indicate an object when that verb typically does not.[161]

Additionally, the content of the verse seems at first glance to go against the theology of retribution developed by the Chronicler in his narrative thus far (Japhet, 1993:906; Klein, 2012:403), so the reader needs to pause to determine how this new development aligns with what has been understood previously.[162]

Externally, it seems more plausible that an allusion in Chronicles would reference the iconic moment of sin by the people of God rather than a passage describing Israel's sin at Sinai would reference one (very) bad king narrated among others.[163]

*Use*. Just as Aaron is the focus of the transitive *Qal* verb פרע in Exod 32:25, so the *Hiphil* form of פרע and its subject (Ahaz) makes Ahaz the focus in 2 Chr 28:19.[164] While the verb does indict the people for acting wildly,[165] both verses highlight the responsibility falling on the leader (Aaron and Ahaz) with an explanatory כִּי clause. In comparing Ahaz to Aaron in his leading the people to sin, we see an underlying negative moral evaluation of Ahaz in this clause of 2 Chr 28:19 in addition to the overt evaluation by the Chronicler in the verse's final clause.[166]

---

[161] If we understand the בְּ here following the normally transitive פרע as a locative preposition (as it is in Judg 5:2), then we may translate this phrase as "for he made unruly in Judah" (cf. NAS, NIV, TNK). The reader is left to ask, "made *what* unruly?". If we understand the compound בִּיהוּדָה as the object of the verb (with ESV, KJV, NET; Klein, 2012:391, 403-404; Japhet, 1993:906-907), then this is the only instance of the verb in the HB/OT where its object is indicated with בְּ.

[162] A curiosity of the text is this is the second of two times the Chronicler identifies a post-division king of Judah as "king of Israel". The other is King Jehoshaphat of Judah in 2 Chr 21:2. King David is called the "King of Israel" multiple times by the Chronicler (e.g., 2 Chr 8:11; 29:27; 30:26), but after the kingdom is split, only two kings of Judah receive such an appellation. It is not unheard of that the Chronicler would use "Israel" where one might expect "Judah" (e.g. 2 Chr 12:6; 23:2), but to call a Judahite king of the divided kingdom "king of Israel" is striking nonetheless. It is curious that in both cases, the preceding pericope about each king describes each asking for aid from a foreign king (2 Chr 20:35; 28:16).

[163] To be fair, Ahaz is the worst Judahite king portrayed in Chronicles and is negatively portrayed in Kings as well. However, the book of Kings portrays Ahaz more as a foil to good kings than the prime example of Judahite monarchial depravity (Sweeney, 2007:381). Manasseh is perhaps the worst Judahite king in the book of Kings (House, 1995:378). This moves Ahaz's overall status away from the worst king in the HB/OT (at least slightly), thus lessening the likelihood that Exodus would compare Israel's sin at Sinai with the actions of this king of Judah.

[164] Cf. Japhet (1993:906) and Klein (2012:391 n. 22) regarding the transitive use of the *Qal* form.

[165] Klein writes of the connection to Exod 32:25, "Judah's acting without restraint reminds the reader of Israel's behavior in the story of the golden calf…" (2012:403).

[166] Ahaz (and implicitly his conduct) is the reason for (בַּעֲבוּר) YHWH humbling Judah. Also, the Chronicler uses the morally important verb מעל (in the only infinitive absolute use of מעל in the HB/OT; cf. Klein, 2012:403) about Ahaz (and possibly Judah as well; cf. Japhet, 1993:906) in the verse's last clause.

*Recurrence*. We do not observe further allusions to Exod 32:25 in Chronicles.

*Holistic Interpretation*. The allusion of moral evaluation in 2 Chr 28 tied to Exod 32 puts King Ahaz squarely into a dark (if not the darkest) time of Israel's past. The people of Israel at Sinai had just been shown a miraculous deliverance and very soon after turned their back on the God who delivered them. So too, the Chronicler presents the history preceding Ahaz as a positive one under Jotham. Despite this, the people of Judah sinned (cf. 2 Chr 27:2). Here in 2 Chr 28, King Ahaz leads them further astray by breaching the terms of the covenant YHWH had made with his people. Presumably, Ahaz had witnessed the faithfulness of his father, Jotham, and the goodness that God provided to his people in response. Still, the leader of the people of Judah, King Ahaz, like Aaron, the very mouthpiece of God in Pharaoh's presence, drew the people under his charge further away with wanton sin that included the casting of idols.

*Reciprocation*. The reader of Exod 32 may wonder how so grievous a sin could be committed against a God who has just saved his people. If the reader of Exod 32 has 2 Chr 28 in mind, the reader may be struck by the repeated rebellion from God by a leader who should have known better. Just as Ahaz's father, Jotham, served YHWH well, so Aaron's brother Moses served YHWH well. However, in the events of Exod 32, the example of Moses made little difference to Aaron, the chosen high priest of God (Exod 28). Likewise, Jotham's example made little difference to Ahaz, God's king over Judah.

*Historical Implications*. We see with this allusion to Exod 32:25 that the Chronicler takes Exodus, and specifically the episode at Sinai, as a text of the utmost severity. He compares the worst king of Judah in his narrative to Moses' brother in that episode and implicitly the people of Judah to Israel. These events at Sinai are a highly significant time in Israelite history, and the Chronicler understands the reign of Ahaz as comparable. We concur with Evans in his analysis of the Chronicler's use of sources in 2 Chr 28 that the Chronicler is demonstrating himself as exegete, historian, and theologian (2013b:164-165).

### 3.2.11 – 2 Chr 29:31

Second Chronicles 29 introduces King Hezekiah and focuses on the corporate restoration of the temple at the king's prompting. In so doing, the Chronicler begins his third-longest narrative about a king (after David and Solomon). The initial chapter of this narrative is replete with references to other HB/OT passages (see Japhet's 1993 and Klein's 2012 commentaries), but our study's focus limits our discussion to allusions to Exodus.

*Marker Identification*. We identify at least three verses in this chapter that have lexical and conceptual connections to the book of Exodus. We have already noted the connection between 2

Chr 29:7 and Exod 30:7 and will not comment further here (see 3.2.8, *Recurrence*). A connection in 2 Chr 29:10 with Exod 32:12 is discussed below (see 3.2.12, *Recurrence*). Second Chronicles 29:3-26 has no parallel in Kings, so these potentially allusive connections are unique to the Chronicler. Before proceeding to the below marker identifications, we note that much of the language in 2 Chr 29:5-24 is reminiscent of Exodus and Leviticus (mostly Exod 29 and Lev 8, both of which are chapters focusing on the ordination of the priests and consecration of the tabernacle's altar of burnt offering).[167] However, we hesitate to identify this language as allusive to Exod 29 because the lexical correlations between 2 Chr 29 and Exod 29 are either approximate to those in Lev 8 or the lexical connections with Lev 8 are slightly stronger.[168]

---

[167] We also observe at least three instances of language chosen by the Chronicler that are reminiscent of language in Exodus (apart from Exod 29) but ultimately leave us unable to make an argument strong enough to label the language in each as allusive.

(1) וַיִּתְּנוּ־עֹרֶף ('and they turned the back/neck') appears in 2 Chr 29:6; Exod 23:27; 2 Sam 22:41 // Ps 18:41. The use of the phrase in 2 Chr 29:6 seems to appeal to the idiomatic language itself rather than the contexts of these other noted passages. It is perhaps a case of shared language with no detectable allusive use (cf. 3.1.2.1).

(2) When it is reported to Hezekiah in 2 Chr 29:18 that the temple has been cleansed, two specific items are also mentioned: the altar of burnt offering and all its utensils (אֶת־מִזְבַּח הָעוֹלָה וְאֶת־כָּל־כֵּלָיו), and the table (of showbread) and all its utensils (וְאֶת־שֻׁלְחַן הַמַּעֲרֶכֶת וְאֶת־כָּל־כֵּלָיו). The phrase "all (its) utensils" is found regularly enough in the HB/OT, some seventy-nine times. However, these two specific items ("altar of burnt offering" and "table") and all their utensils appear in the same immediate context in only four locations in the HB/OT: Exod 30:27-28; 31:8-9; 35:13, 16; and 2 Chr 29:18. There is nothing in the language of each of these Exodus passages to indicate a stronger lexical connection with 2 Chr 29:18 than the other Exodus passages. None of these Exodus passages uses the term מַעֲרֶכֶת like in 2 Chr 29:18. If anything, both phrases in Exod 35:16 have intervening terms between אֶת־הַשֻּׁלְחָן and וְאֶת־כָּל־כֵּלָיו, and אֵת מִזְבַּח הָעֹלָה and וְאֶת־כָּל־כֵּלָיו, so a lexical connection to that passage could be argued as weaker. We are left to conclude that the Chronicler is using the language of these Exodus passages without specifically alluding to them. Cf. Japhet (1993:923) and Klein (2012:420) who suggest the altar of burnt offering was specified because it is outside the building proper. It is difficult to determine any reason(s) the table of showbread was specified in 2 Chr 29:18.

(3) The verbs שׁרת ('to minister/serve') and קטר ('to make a sacrifice') appear together within three verses of each other in only six passages in the HB/OT: Exod 30:20; 1 Sam 2:15-18; 1 Chr 23:13; 2 Chr 13:10-11; 2 Chr 29:11; and Jer 33:18-21. Each passage speaks of priestly duties. The use in Exod 30:20 defines when the priests are to wash with water: when they enter the tent of meeting or when they draw near to the altar to minister, to make a sacrifice with fire to YHWH. While the lexical connection exists, the emphasis of the passage is in fact about the washing protocol of the priests and not on their specific duties after washing (cf. Stuart, 2006:640). It is difficult to argue for an allusive use in the noted Chronicles passages when the original context is about washing and not the chosen status of the priests and their specific duties in that chosen work. Thus, this is perhaps another case of shared language without allusive use (cf. 3.1.2.1).

[168] Perhaps the clearest lexical connection between 2 Chr 29; Exod 29; and Lev 8 is the phrase חטא הַמִּזְבֵּחָה ('purify the altar'), which appears in Exod 29:36; Lev 8:15; 2 Chr 29:24; and Ezek 43:22. There is a further connection in 2 Chr 29:24 to Exod 29:36 and Lev 8:15 with the term כפר ('to atone'). Lastly, we understand the additional lexical connections of שׁחט ('to slaughter') and דָּם ('blood') between to 2 Chr 29:24 and Lev 8:15 to indicate the strongest

The remaining lexical connection of note to Exodus in 2 Chr 29 concerns the phrase כֹּל נָדִיב לֵב (‘all willing of heart’); it appears only in Exod 35:5, 22; and 2 Chr 29:31 in the HB/OT. This phrase is either the only subject of the verb בוא (in the *Hiphil*, ‘to bring’) or one of its subjects in each of the three verses. The contexts of each verse align as well: in Exod 35:5, 22, the people are bringing material contributions for the construction of the tabernacle; in 2 Chr 29:31, the people are bringing offerings for the restoration of the temple (cf. 2 Chr 29:35).

*Coherence*. The coherence of Exod 35:5, 22 and 2 Chr 29:31 favors seeing 2 Chr 29:31 as the alluding text. There is nothing in the grammar or syntax of the Exodus passages that indicates the key phrase is somehow out of place. However, a large amount of the vocabulary in 2 Chr 29:31 is reminiscent of cultic terminology from the Pentateuch (not least of which is the idea of the non-priestly assembly [קָהָל] consecrating themselves [מִלֵּאתֶם יֶדְכֶם], a term typically reserved for priests; cf. Klein, 2012:424). The surrounding language of 2 Chr 29:31 inclines the reader to think of references elsewhere. That the unique phrase כֹּל נָדִיב לֵב would come from somewhere else in the HB/OT does not surprise and is perhaps expected given its immediate lexical context.

Regarding the external coherence of these passages, does it make more sense for a twice repeated unique phrase in Exodus regarding the development of the first-ever building for the God of Israel to allude to the sacrifices used in the restoration of that same God’s neglected temple later

---

lexical connection between those two passages. The term חַטָּאת (‘sin offering’) does appear in Exod 29:36; 2 Chr 29:24; and Ezek 43:22 (but not Lev 8:15). However, with so few other connections to Ezek 43 in 2 Chr 29, especially compared to Exod 29:36 and Lev 8:15, the data incline us to see connections in 2 Chr 29:24 primarily to Exod 29 or Lev 8, with the slightly stronger connections existing to the latter. Other lexical connections between 2 Chr 29; Exod 29; and/or Lev 8 include the following: (1) the terms קדשׁ in the *Piel* stem (‘to consecrate’; Exod 29:1, 27, 33, 36, 37, 44 [x2]; Lev 8:10, 11, 12, 15, 30; 2 Chr 29:5, 17 [x2]); and חַטָּאת (Exod 29:14, 36; Lev 8:2, 14 [x2]; 2 Chr 29:21, 23, 24); (2) the sacrificial animals פַּר (‘bull’; Exod 29:1, 3, 10 [x2], 11, 12, 14, 36; Lev 8:2, 14 [x2], 17; 2 Chr 29:21); אַיִל (‘ram’; Exod 29:1, 3, 15 [x2], 16, 17, 18, 19 [x2], 20, 22, 26, 27, 31, 32; Lev 8:2, 18 [x2], 20, 21, 22 [x3], 29; 2 Chr 29:21, 22, 32); and כֶּבֶשׂ (‘lamb’; Exod 29:38, 39 [x2], 40, 41; 2 Chr 29:21, 22, 32); (3) the terms שׁחט, דָּם, זרק (‘to throw/scatter’), and מִזְבֵּחַ (‘altar’) appearing together in Exod 29:16, 20; Lev 8:19; and 2 Chr 29:22; (4) laying one’s hands on a sacrificial animal (סמך יָד עַל; Exod 29:10, 15, 19; 8:14, 18, 22; 2 Chr 29:23); and (5) the concept of filling one’s hands (מלא יָד; Exod 29:9, 29, 33, 35; Lev 8:33; 2 Chr 29:31). Certainly, these terms and combinations of terms do appear elsewhere in the HB/OT, but the concentration of them in Exod 29 and Lev 8 indicate a relationship between those passages and 2 Chr 29. With the shared contexts of Exod 29 and Lev 8, and the slightly stronger lexical connections to Lev 8, we see a greater connection between 2 Chr 29 and Lev 8. Further study on the shared language between 2 Chr 29 and Lev 8 is warranted.

in the nation's history or for the reverse to be true? If the former, then perhaps the author of Exodus is indicating the people of Moses' time are like the people of Hezekiah's: people who were previously sinful (e.g., the calf episode at Sinai) are trying to respond well to a covenant (cf. Exod 34:10ff.) through establishing the place of worship like the people of Hezekiah's time who had previously sinned (e.g., neglecting the temple under Ahaz) but then responded to a call for a covenant (2 Chr 29:10) with sacrificial offerings for the temple's restoration. If the latter, then the Chronicler is likening the people and their contributions responsible for the restoration of temple worship to the people who initially gave freely to provide for the glory of the original tabernacle, indicating a return to the house of worship as it was intended. Because the Chronicler specifically attributes the sins of 2 Chr 28 to King Ahaz rather than the people (cf. 28:1-4; 16, 19, 22-25), we believe the latter direction of dependence is more likely.

*Use*. Klein notes a connection between Exod 35 and 2 Chr 29 but does not discuss the relationship's significance (2012:424 n. 85). Japhet says the description of the people in 2 Chr 29:31 "brings to mind the great precedents of the contributions for the tabernacle (Exod. 35:21–29), and the Temple (1 Chron. 29:5–9)" but does not comment further about the importance of those precedents (1993:929). What then is the significance of this allusion to Exod 35? This allusion compares the people of Hezekiah's time and the people of Moses' time. By using this unique phrase in 2 Chr 29:31, the Chronicler likens the enthusiastic and proper response of Judah in Hezekiah's reign to the people who brought so many contributions for the tabernacle that their generosity brought in more than enough and had to be stopped (cf. Exod 36:3-7). The provision for and construction of the tabernacle is heralded in positive terms later in Exodus and repeatedly understood as following the command of YHWH to Moses.[169] The people in Exodus did well to follow the command of YHWH (through Moses); in Chronicles, the Chronicler is positioning the people under Hezekiah in the same light. They bring sacrifices in such quantity that the temple worship is restored in great abundance and rejoicing (2 Chr 29:35-36). This allusive use is a positive moral evaluation of the people of Hezekiah's reign.

*Recurrence*. We do not observe further allusions to Exod 35:5, 22 in Chronicles.

*Holistic Interpretation*. Along with the positive moral evaluation of the people in Judah, we see two indirect comparisons: of the temple to the tabernacle and of Hezekiah to Moses. As Exodus highlights the tabernacle and the requisite provision and construction as something celebratory and to be blessed (Exod 39:42-43), so the Chronicler is positioning the restoration of temple worship (and the requisite provision of sacrificial animals) as laudatory (see again 2 Chr 29:35-36). Both

[169] Exod 35:4, 29; 36:5; 38:22; 39:1, 5, 7, 21, 26, 29, 31, 32, 42, 43; 40:16, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 32.

buildings are the end goal of these provisions and are celebrated in both contexts. Likewise, just as Moses issued the commands of God for the people to bring generously, so Hezekiah's reforms compare to these initial commands for the people to provide for the place of worship.

*Reciprocation*. When a reader of Exod 35 considers the allusion in 2 Chr 29:31, the Exodus reader sees that the care for their place of worship will extend beyond that one Exodus generation. Yes, the Chronicler has detailed multiple examples of future kings and their kingdoms who harmed the temple (whether directly or by neglecting it). However, the reader of Exod 35 with 2 Chr 29 in mind is reminded that Hezekiah and his people cared for their place of worship just like Moses and his people did. Care for the place of worship is not isolated to Exodus. It extends throughout Israelite history.

*Historical Implications*. Thompson observes a relevance for the Chronicler's time in the connection between the generosity seen in Exodus and in 2 Chr 29. "The responsiveness of the people recalls events at the time of Moses, David, and Solomon... Here was a pattern to be followed by the Chronicler's postexilic audience" (Thompson, 1994:349). The Chronicler is not just recording Israelite history; through allusion, he makes Israelite history new again and relevant for his audience. He is applying the ancient stories to his context and exhorting those who would listen. As the Israelites in Moses' and Hezekiah's times followed God's commands for generous provision for the place of worship, so the Chronicler's audience could and should also.

### 3.2.12 – 2 Chr 30:6-9

Second Chronicles 30 continues the Hezekiah narrative. The chapter concerns the reinstitution of the Passover celebration. It would not surprise then to have multiple references in the chapter to pentateuchal texts concerning the Passover feast legislation (cf. Spawn, 2012:323-328; Schweitzer, 2011:52-53; Japhet, 1993:952). However, these references are often general and difficult to establish as part of an allusive relationship (see, e.g., 2 Chr 30:3, 5, 16, 18; cf. Klein, 2012:437).[170]

---

[170] As two examples, we see the lexical terms פֶּסַח and חַג מַצָּה in 2 Chr 30 as Appeals to General Concepts (see 3.1.2.2). As one would expect, the term פֶּסַח ('Passover') appears multiple times in 2 Chr 30; six times total in vv. 1, 2, 5, 15, 17, 18. The term occurs numerous times throughout the HB/OT (see, e.g., Exod 12; Lev 23; Num 9; 28; 33; Deut 16; Josh 5). Certainly, there is great exegetical importance to the time periods noted in 2 Chr 30 as they relate to the פֶּסַח (see, e.g., Schweitzer, 2011:52-53; Klein, 2012:432) as well as other details of its proper observation according to the Torah. However, the term's high frequency throughout the HB/OT and lack of additional specific lexical connections make it difficult to determine if the Chronicler has a particular passage in mind when he references the פֶּסַח and the commands regarding its observation.

Amongst these general references, we also observe multiple specific connections to Exodus. We focus below on these specific connections.

*Marker Identification*. Exodus 32:8-13 and 2 Chr 30:6-9 are the only two passages in the HB/OT that contain the concentration of the following terms and phrases: שׁוּב (‘to turn/return’), קִשָּׁה עֹרֶף (‘to harden the neck’), חָרוֹן אַף (‘burning anger’), סוּר (‘to take away’), and אַבְרָהָם יִצְחָק וְיִשְׂרָאֵל (‘Abraham, Isaac, and Israel’).[171] Only Neh 9:16-19, 26-32 and 2 Chr 30:6-9 contain: שׁוּב (‘to turn/return’), קִשָּׁה עֹרֶף (‘to harden the neck’), סוּר (‘to take away’), אָב (in the plural, ‘fathers’), חַנּוּן וְרַחוּם (‘gracious and compassionate’), רַחֲמִים (‘mercy/compassion’), and מַלְכֵי אַשּׁוּר (‘kings of Assyria’). We thus see lexical overlap in all three passages (שׁוּב, קִשָּׁה עֹרֶף, סוּר) as well as exclusivity with 2 Chr 30:6-9 in both Exod 32:8-13 (אַבְרָהָם יִצְחָק וְיִשְׂרָאֵל, אַף חָרוֹן) and Neh 9:16-19, 26-32 (אָב, חַנּוּן וְרַחוּם, רַחֲמִים, מַלְכֵי אַשּׁוּר).[172] We do see a stronger connection with the continued use of שׁוּב between 2 Chr 30:6-9 (six times) and Neh 9:16-19, 26-32 (five times).[173] Exodus 32:8-13 only uses שׁוּב once (in v. 12). Second Chronicles 30 has no parallel in Kings, so these potentially allusive connections are unique to the Chronicler. We display the lexical connections further below. The lexical connections indicate the two most probable relationships between the texts are that either Exod 32 and Neh 9 independently allude to elements of 2 Chr 30

---

Similarly, חַג מַצָּה (‘Feast of Unleavened Bread’) appears twice in 2 Chr 30 in vv. 13 and 21. These terms for the Feast of Unleavened Bread also appear in a number of passages in the HB/OT: Exod 13:6-7; 23:15-16; 34:18; Lev 23:6; Num 28:17; Deut 16:16; 2 Chr 8:13; 35:17; Ezra 6:22. There is again exegetical importance to the combination of the Passover and Feast of Unleavened Bread in 2 Chr 30 under Hezekiah (see Japhet’s 1993 and Klein’s 2012 commentaries), but there is great difficulty in precisely identifying one or more evoked texts without further lexical markers.

[171] Some are inclined to see a connection in the latter phrase here to Exod 3:15-16 (Japhet, 1993:944; Klein, 2012:434) or to 1 Kgs 18:36 (Klein, 2012:434), but the evidence suggests the stronger connection is to the more plentifully shared language of Exod 32:13 and its context. We discuss the connection to use of the patriarchs’ names in 1 Chr 29:18 in *Recurrence*. We also note the Chronicler rarely uses the name יַעֲקֹב (‘Jacob’). He uses the name only twice (1 Chr 16:13, 17) when he is quoting Ps 105:6, 10 (Klein, 2006:365).

[172] Certainly, each of these individual terms/phrases, or combinations of them, appear elsewhere in the HB/OT, but it is only in these noted passages where they occur in such concentration.

[173] Japhet notes a possible connection between 2 Chr 30:6-7 and Zech 1:3-4 and Mal 3:7 (1993:943; cf. Klein, 2012:434). We do not deny the lexical and conceptual connections present in those texts, but we observe stronger lexical and conceptual connections between 2 Chr 30:6-9; Exod 32:8-13; and Neh 9:16-19, 26-32.

(with each of the former two using elements of the latter) or that 2 Chr 30 has combined elements of Exod 32 and Neh 9 and is alluding to both passages.

There is a direct conceptual link between the Exodus and Nehemiah passages and an indirect link with the 2 Chr 30 text. In Exod 32:8-13, God informs Moses of the people's sin with the golden calf, and Moses responds with intercession on the people's behalf. In Neh 9:16-19, 26-32, certain Levites stand before the people and speak a confession of Israel's sins, including the period of Israel's sin with the golden calf (9:16-19). In 2 Chr 30:6-9, King Hezekiah of Judah sends a message to both the northern and southern kingdoms calling them to celebrate the Passover, forsaking the sin(s) of their past (he does not specify the sin[s]).

2 Chr 30:6-9

6 וַיֵּלְכוּ הָרָצִים בְּאִגְּרוֹת מִיַּד הַמֶּלֶךְ וְשָׂרָיו
בְּכָל־יִשְׂרָאֵל וִיהוּדָה וּכְמִצְוַת הַמֶּלֶךְ לֵאמֹר
בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל שׁוּבוּ אֶל־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי
אַבְרָהָם יִצְחָק וְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְיָשָׁב אֶל־הַפְּלֵיטָה
הַנִּשְׁאֶרֶת לָכֶם מִכַּף מַלְכֵי אַשּׁוּר׃
7 וְאַל־תִּהְיוּ כַּאֲבוֹתֵיכֶם וְכַאֲחֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר
מָעֲלוּ בַּיהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתֵיהֶם וַיִּתְּנֵם לְשַׁמָּה
כַּאֲשֶׁר אַתֶּם רֹאִים׃
8 עַתָּה אַל־תַּקְשׁוּ עָרְפְּכֶם כַּאֲבוֹתֵיכֶם
תְּנוּ־יָד לַיהוָה וּבֹאוּ לְמִקְדָּשׁוֹ אֲשֶׁר הִקְדִּישׁ
לְעוֹלָם וְעִבְדוּ אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וְיָשֹׁב
מִכֶּם חֲרוֹן אַפּוֹ׃
9 כִּי בְּשׁוּבְכֶם עַל־יְהוָה אֲחֵיכֶם וּבְנֵיכֶם
לְרַחֲמִים לִפְנֵי שׁוֹבֵיהֶם וְלָשׁוּב לָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת
כִּי־חַנּוּן וְרַחוּם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם
וְלֹא־יָסִיר פָּנִים מִכֶּם אִם־תָּשׁוּבוּ אֵלָיו׃

Exod 32:8-13

8 סָרוּ מַהֵר מִן־הַדֶּרֶךְ אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִם עָשׂוּ לָהֶם עֵגֶל
מַסֵּכָה וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲווּ־לוֹ וַיִּזְבְּחוּ־לוֹ וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֵלֶּה אֱלֹהֶיךָ
יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר הֶעֱלוּךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם׃
9 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה רָאִיתִי אֶת־הָעָם הַזֶּה
וְהִנֵּה עַם־קְשֵׁה־עֹרֶף הוּא׃
10 וְעַתָּה הַנִּיחָה לִי וְיִחַר־אַפִּי בָהֶם וַאֲכַלֵּם וְאֶעֱשֶׂה
אוֹתְךָ לְגוֹי גָּדוֹל׃
11 וַיְחַל מֹשֶׁה אֶת־פְּנֵי יְהוָה אֱלֹהָיו וַיֹּאמֶר לָמָּה יְהוָה
יֶחֱרֶה אַפְּךָ בְּעַמֶּךָ אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם בְּכֹחַ
גָּדוֹל וּבְיָד חֲזָקָה׃
12 לָמָּה יֹאמְרוּ מִצְרַיִם לֵאמֹר בְּרָעָה הוֹצִיאָם לַהֲרֹג
אֹתָם בֶּהָרִים וּלְכַלֹּתָם מֵעַל פְּנֵי הָאֲדָמָה שׁוּב
מֵחֲרוֹן אַפֶּךָ וְהִנָּחֵם עַל־הָרָעָה לְעַמֶּךָ׃
13 זְכֹר לְאַבְרָהָם לְיִצְחָק וּלְיִשְׂרָאֵל עֲבָדֶיךָ אֲשֶׁר
נִשְׁבַּעְתָּ לָהֶם בָּךְ וַתְּדַבֵּר אֲלֵהֶם אַרְבֶּה אֶת־זַרְעֲכֶם
כְּכוֹכְבֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם וְכָל־הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת אֲשֶׁר אָמַרְתִּי אֶתֵּן
לְזַרְעֲכֶם וְנָחֲלוּ לְעֹלָם׃

Neh 9:16-19, 26-32

16 וְהֵם וַאֲבוֹתֵינוּ הֵזִידוּ וַיַּקְשׁוּ אֶת־עָרְפָּם וְלֹא
שָׁמְעוּ אֶל־מִצְוֹתֶיךָ: 17 וַיְמָאֲנוּ לִשְׁמֹעַ וְלֹא־זָכְרוּ
נִפְלְאוֹתֶיךָ אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתָ עִמָּהֶם וַיַּקְשׁוּ אֶת־עָרְפָּם
וַיִּתְּנוּ־רֹאשׁ לָשׁוּב לְעַבְדָתָם בְּמִרְיָם וְאַתָּה אֱלוֹהַּ
סְלִיחוֹת חַנּוּן וְרַחוּם אֶרֶךְ־אַפַּיִם וְרַב־וְחֶסֶד וְלֹא
עֲזַבְתָּם: 18 אַף כִּי־עָשׂוּ לָהֶם עֵגֶל מַסֵּכָה וַיֹּאמְרוּ
זֶה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֲשֶׁר הֶעֱלְךָ מִמִּצְרַיִם וַיַּעֲשׂוּ נָאָצוֹת
גְּדֹלוֹת: 19 וְאַתָּה בְּרַחֲמֶיךָ הָרַבִּים לֹא עֲזַבְתָּם
בַּמִּדְבָּר אֶת־עַמּוּד הֶעָנָן לֹא־סָר מֵעֲלֵיהֶם בְּיוֹמָם
לְהַנְחֹתָם בְּהַדֶּרֶךְ וְאֶת־עַמּוּד הָאֵשׁ בְּלַיְלָה לְהָאִיר
לָהֶם וְאֶת־הַדֶּרֶךְ אֲשֶׁר יֵלְכוּ־בָהּ: 26 וַיַּמְרוּ וַיִּמְרְדוּ
בָךְ וַיַּשְׁלִכוּ אֶת־תּוֹרָתְךָ אַחֲרֵי גֵּוָם וְאֶת־נְבִיאֶיךָ
הָרְגוּ אֲשֶׁר־הֵעִידוּ בָם לַהֲשִׁיבָם אֵלֶיךָ וַיַּעֲשׂוּ
נָאָצוֹת גְּדוֹלוֹת: 27 וַתִּתְּנֵם בְּיַד צָרֵיהֶם וַיָּצֵרוּ לָהֶם
וּבְעֵת צָרָתָם יִצְעֲקוּ אֵלֶיךָ וְאַתָּה מִשָּׁמַיִם תִּשְׁמָע
וּכְרַחֲמֶיךָ הָרַבִּים תִּתֶּן לָהֶם מוֹשִׁיעִים וְיוֹשִׁיעוּם
מִיַּד צָרֵיהֶם: 28 וּכְנוֹחַ לָהֶם יָשׁוּבוּ לַעֲשׂוֹת רַע
לְפָנֶיךָ וַתַּעַזְבֵם בְּיַד אוֹיְבֵיהֶם וַיִּרְדוּ בָהֶם וַיָּשׁוּבוּ
וַיִּזְעָקוּ וְאַתָּה מִשָּׁמַיִם תִּשְׁמַע וְתַצִּילֵם כְּרַחֲמֶיךָ
רַבּוֹת עִתִּים: 29 וַתָּעַד בָּהֶם לַהֲשִׁיבָם אֶל־תּוֹרָתֶךָ
וְהֵמָּה הֵזִידוּ וְלֹא־שָׁמְעוּ לְמִצְוֹתֶיךָ וּבְמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ
חָטְאוּ־בָם אֲשֶׁר־יַעֲשֶׂה אָדָם וְחָיָה בָהֶם וַיִּתְּנוּ
כָתֵף סוֹרֶרֶת וְעָרְפָּם הִקְשׁוּ וְלֹא שָׁמֵעוּ: 30 וַתִּמְשֹׁךְ
עֲלֵיהֶם שָׁנִים רַבּוֹת וַתָּעַד בָּם בְּרוּחֲךָ בְּיַד־נְבִיאֶיךָ
וְלֹא הֶאֱזִינוּ וַתִּתְּנֵם בְּיַד עַמֵּי הָאֲרָצוֹת:
31 וּבְרַחֲמֶיךָ הָרַבִּים לֹא־עָשִׂיתָם כָּלָה וְלֹא
עֲזַבְתָּם כִּי אֵל־חַנּוּן וְרַחוּם אָתָּה: 32 וְעַתָּה אֱלֹהֵינוּ
הָאֵל הַגָּדוֹל הַגִּבּוֹר וְהַנּוֹרָא שֹׁמֵר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֶסֶד
אַל־יִמְעַט לְפָנֶיךָ אֵת כָּל־הַתְּלָאָה אֲשֶׁר־מְצָאַתְנוּ
לְמְלָכֵינוּ לְשָׂרֵינוּ וּלְכֹהֲנֵינוּ וְלִנְבִיאֵינוּ וְלַאֲבֹתֵינוּ
וּלְכָל־עַמֶּךָ מִימֵי מַלְכֵי אַשּׁוּר עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה:

2 Chr 30:6-9

6 וַיֵּלְכוּ הָרָצִים בָּאִגְּרוֹת מִיַּד הַמֶּלֶךְ וְשָׂרָיו
בְּכָל־יִשְׂרָאֵל וִיהוּדָה וּכְמִצְוַת הַמֶּלֶךְ לֵאמֹר בְּנֵי
יִשְׂרָאֵל שׁוּבוּ אֶל־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי
אַבְרָהָם יִצְחָק וְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְיָשָׁב אֶל־הַפְּלֵיטָה
הַנִּשְׁאֶרֶת לָכֶם מִכַּף מַלְכֵי אַשּׁוּר:
7 וְאַל־תִּהְיוּ כַּאֲבוֹתֵיכֶם וְכַאֲחֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר מָעֲלוּ
בַּיהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתֵיהֶם וַיִּתְּנֵם לְשַׁמָּה כַּאֲשֶׁר
אַתֶּם רֹאִים:
8 עַתָּה אַל־תַּקְשׁוּ עָרְפְּכֶם כַּאֲבוֹתֵיכֶם תְּנוּ־יָד
לַיהוָה וּבֹאוּ לְמִקְדָּשׁוֹ אֲשֶׁר הִקְדִּישׁ לְעוֹלָם
וְעִבְדוּ אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וְיָשֹׁב מִכֶּם
חֲרוֹן אַפּוֹ:
9 כִּי בְשׁוּבְכֶם עַל־יְהוָה אֲחֵיכֶם וּבְנֵיכֶם
לְרַחֲמִים לִפְנֵי שׁוֹבֵיהֶם וְלָשׁוּב לָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת
כִּי־חַנּוּן וְרַחוּם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וְלֹא־יָסִיר פָּנִים
מִכֶּם אִם־תָּשׁוּבוּ אֵלָיו:

*Date.* We have already addressed the relative dating of Exodus being prior to Chronicles, but we must briefly discuss the dating of Nehemiah relative to Chronicles. Scholars generally see the initial composition of the book of Nehemiah, or the time of its origin, occurring in the late fifth century BCE and the completion of editing around 300 BCE (Farisani, 2004:226-228; cf. Williamson, 1985:xxxvi).[174] With a general date of the mid-to-late fourth century BCE for 2 Chronicles (see 1.3.3 and 2.3.2), (proto-) Nehemiah theoretically would have been available to the Chronicler, but, due to the potential dating of the editing of Nehemiah, we cannot conclude with certainty based on dating alone that Nehemiah completely preceded Chronicles. When one examines the internal evidence of Chronicles, however, we see that Chronicles indeed uses Nehemiah as a source elsewhere in his work (Japhet, 1993:14, 18; Klein, 2006:38; cf. Pakkala, 2004:246-248, 275). Based on these conclusions, we hold to the relative dating of Nehemiah preceding Chronicles.

*Coherence*. Based on the internal and external coherence of 2 Chr 30:6-9 and its connected passages, we see 2 Chr 30:6-9 as the alluding text and Exod 32:8-13 and Neh 9:16-19, 26-32 as the evoked texts. Regarding internal coherence, the Exodus passage has at least one indication that it is an evoked text. In Exod 32:9, YHWH speaks of a stiff-necked people; both 2 Chr 30:8 and Neh 9:16 speak of stiffening necks but use the more specific "fathers". This specification inclines the reader to see the latter two texts as building upon Exod 32:9 (cf. Carr's third criterion, 2001:111). We see the same principle when comparing Neh 9:31 and 2 Chr 30:9. Nehemiah 9:31 ends כִּי אֵל־ חַנּוּן וְרַחוּם אָתָּה ('for a gracious and compassionate God are you'). Second Chronicles 30:9 contains a similar כִּי clause: כִּי־חַנּוּן וְרַחוּם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם ('for gracious and compassionate is YHWH your God').[175] Instead of the more general אֵל in Neh 9:31, the Chronicler has chosen to use the more specific יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם. Regarding external coherence, the essence of Hezekiah's message in 2 Chr 30:6-9 is to call people away from past sins. It then makes more sense for that call to allude to examples of past sins (like in Exod 32) or summaries of past sins (as in Neh 9) than for a

[174] This later completion of Nehemiah's editing may also be understood to include the book of Nehemiah's integration into, or combination with, the book of Ezra (cf. Heckl, 2018:131). Pakkala suggests the editing of certain parts of Ezra and its combination with material from Nehemiah took place sometime "from the fourth to the beginning of the third centuries BCE" (2004:271, 273-274, here 274). Others place the combination of Ezra and Nehemiah much later, based, in part, on external considerations (see, e.g., Wright, 2007:346-347; Heckl, 2016:403-410).

[175] These adjectives are also present in Neh 9:17, but we see the stronger connection between the uses in Neh 9:31 and 2 Chr 30:9 because of the initial כִּי in the clause.

discussion of those sins (either the initial narration or a recollection of them) to allude to a retrospective call to turn away from those same sins.

*Use*. Hezekiah's call to Israel to return to YHWH and the right worship of him uses multiple connections to Exod 32:8-13 (the narration of the golden calf sin at Sinai); Neh 9:16-19 (a confession regarding that sin at Sinai); and Neh 9:26-32 (a confession of Israel's sins after entering the promised land which led to their exile) to highlight that the people's continued disobedience is just like the golden calf sin of Israel at Sinai and the sin that led them to exile. The situation is that dire; their present opposition to God mirrors the sins at the nation's founding and its (northern) end. The allusive use constitutes a moral evaluation of the people's sin in Hezekiah's time (in both the northern and southern kingdoms). Additionally, the allusive use of Exod 32:8-13 and Neh 9:16-19 has a strangely unifying effect as both Israel and Judah (2 Chr 30:6) have a shared heritage of the golden calf sin.[176] The use of סור points to an intertwining of meanings by the Chronicler. In contrast to how the people of Israel turned away quickly from the way of God (סָרוּ מַהֵר מִן־הַדֶּרֶךְ, Exod 32:8), and similar to how the pillar of cloud did not turn from the people ( עַמּוּד הֶעָנָן לֹא־סָר מֵעֲלֵיהֶם, Neh 9:19), Hezekiah assures in his message that God will not turn his face from the people (וְלֹא־יָסִיר פָּנִים מִכֶּם, 2 Chr 30:9) if they return to God.

*Recurrence*. We do not observe elsewhere in Chronicles another instance of the concentration of terms discussed above. Certain individual words and phrases from the accumulation of connections above appear elsewhere in Chronicles. However, it is possible to argue for an allusive relationship to Exod 32 for only two of them.[177]

---

[176] Along with the negative heritage, the unifying effect is also seen in the use of the long epithet for God ( יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם יִצְחָק וְיִשְׂרָאֵל) in 2 Chr 30:6 (Japhet, 1993:944; Jonker, 2013a:272).

[177] The unique formula אַבְרָהָם יִצְחָק וְיִשְׂרָאֵל ('Abraham, Isaac, and Israel') does appear one other time in Chronicles, 1 Chr 29:18. The use in 2 Chr 30:6 matches the full title in 1 Chr 29:18, יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם יִצְחָק וְיִשְׂרָאֵל ('YHWH the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel'). The use in 1 Chr 29:18 is a powerful reminder of the promise in which David and his people stand (cf. Hicks, 2001:253), but one struggles to see an allusion to Exod 32 or Neh 9 there. The phrase חָרוֹן אַף ('burning anger') occurs in 2 Chr 28:11, 13, and the term רַחֲמִים ('mercy/compassion') occurs in 1 Chr 21:13, but those uses do not appear to be allusions to Exod 32 or Neh 9. The use of the phrase חָרוֹן אַף in 2 Chr 29:10 is discussed below. The terms חַנּוּן וְרַחוּם ('gracious and compassionate') appear together only in 2 Chr 30:9 in Chronicles. The term שׁוּב ('to turn/return') appears a total of sixty-seven times in Chronicles; this study did not find

There is a connection to Exod 32:12 in 2 Chr 29:10 related to the phrase וְיָשֹׁב מִמֶּנּוּ חֲרוֹן אַפּוֹ ('so his burning anger might turn from us').[178] Moses says to YHWH in Exod 32:12, שׁוּב מֵחֲרוֹן אַפֶּךָ ('Turn from your burning anger'). While the concept of "turning from burning anger" is not unique to Exod 32 or 2 Chr 29,[179] the conceptual connection between the two passages and the presence of the allusion in 2 Chr 30:8 inclines us to see an allusion to Exod 32:12 here in 2 Chr 29:10 as well. Moses immediately follows his plea for YHWH to turn from his wrath by invoking the names of the forefathers and the covenantal promise associated with them (Exod 32:13; cf. Gen 15:5; 22:17; 26:4). In 2 Chr 29:10, following a reflection upon the sins that led his people into captivity, King Hezekiah declares his intent to make a covenant with YHWH that his God would turn his burning anger. Just as Moses invoked a covenant to support his plea for mercy, so Hezekiah wants to make a covenant with YHWH to prompt him to give mercy. We see then a secondary positive moral evaluation of Hezekiah as he follows in Moses' footsteps.

We tentatively identify an allusion in the additional use of the phrase וַיְקַשֵּׁ֥ה אֶת־עָרְפּוֹ ('and he stiffened his neck') in 2 Chr 36:13 regarding King Zedekiah.[180] This is the only other occurrence of the phrase in Chronicles besides 2 Chr 30:8 and is a sobering evaluation of the final king of Judah. Zedekiah is likened to the people of Israel when they were at one of their lowest points. This negative moral evaluation by the Chronicler places the end of Judah's leadership squarely in the footsteps of his forebears when their nation began. We say "tentatively" above because there is an argument to be made that 2 Chr 36:13 could be connected to Deut 10:16. The presence of the allusion earlier in 2 Chronicles provides a slight preference to see it as a similar allusion, but we note the possibility of a link elsewhere.[181]

*Holistic Interpretation*. These allusions to Exod 32 and Neh 9 highlight both the despicable nature of the sins of the people during Hezekiah's reign and, at the same time, the gracious

---

outside of 2 Chr 29:10 and 30:6-9 additional lexical connections among those uses to indicate an allusive connection to Exod 32 and Neh 9.

[178] Second Chronicles 29:10 does not have a parallel in Kings and is unique to the Chronicler. Cf. 3.2.11.

[179] See also Num 25:4; Deut 13:18(17); Josh 7:26; 2 Kgs 23:26; Ezra 10:14; Ps 85:4(3); Jer 4:8; 30:24; Jon 3:9. These other passages do not have a similar conceptual connection to 2 Chr 29:10.

[180] This phrase here is unique to the Chronicler as only the beginning of 2 Chr 36:13 is sourced from elsewhere (Klein, 2012:540).

[181] Japhet notes the Chronicler in 2 Chr 36:13 has used "conventional metaphors with broad literary associations…" (1993:1070). Klein sees a connection here to Deut 10:16 (2012:540). This is not unfounded with both the use of the "stiffen the neck" phrase and a mention of the heart (לֵבָב) in both passages. However, as noted, because of the use of the phrase earlier by the Chronicler as a moral evaluation, we are inclined to see the use of the "stiffen the neck" phrase in 2 Chr 36:13 as a recurrence of the earlier allusion, albeit with some reservation.

relationship YHWH has maintained with his people, all of his people (both the northern and southern kingdoms), throughout their history. The kindness of Israel's God is rooted in his compassionate character and faithfulness to his covenants; these traits may be appealed to and relied upon when his people commit atrocities against those covenants. The same kindness and mercy of God that saved Israel in her earlier days is the same kindness and mercy that can draw the people of Hezekiah's time back to God.

*Reciprocation*. When one reads Exod 32 with the noted connected texts in mind (Neh 9 and 2 Chr 30), one sees how the sin of the golden calf at Sinai leaves an indelible mark on Israel. It will be remembered for generations to come, shaping national confessions (Neh 9) and calls to repentance (2 Chr 30). The severity of the sin is intense not just because of the disobedience in the moment and the wrath of God against which Moses must offer intercession, but the severity of the sin is further intensified because of the lasting and painful memory that will remain in the minds of Israelites for centuries.

*Historical Implications*. The appeal to a time when Israel sinned greatly and when her God forgave her fully is extremely relevant for the Chronicler's audience. Hezekiah offers to his northern neighbors in 2 Chr 30:9 a way for the captives to come home. After the exile—the discipline God issued for Israel's continued disobedience—the nation returned to their homeland broken. With Hezekiah's message, the Chronicler can offer hope and restoration to his audience; this was not the first time God had forgiven his people of grievous sins. The Chronicler's audience could fully return from their exile as well; God would turn his face towards them again if only they would return to him.

### 3.2.13 – 2 Chr 32:21

The king of Assyria, Sennacherib, comes up against King Hezekiah in Jerusalem in 2 Chr 32. Hezekiah responds by preparing the city and the people for the coming siege. Sennacherib taunts Jerusalem and speaks against Hezekiah and YHWH. Hezekiah and Isaiah the prophet pray, crying out to heaven. In 2 Chr 32:21, YHWH provides deliverance.

*Marker Identification*. The verb כחד ('to efface, to hide') appears thirty-two times in the HB/OT. However, it appears in the *Hiphil* only six times: Exod 23:23; 1 Kgs 13:34; 2 Chr 32:21; Job 20:12; Ps 83:5; Zech 11:8. Further still, the *Hiphil* of כחד in the context of YHWH sending (שׁלח) an angel (מַלְאָךְ) to destroy enemies appears only in Exod 23 and 2 Chr 32. In Exod 23:20-23, God promises to send an angel before his people as they enter the promised land. The people are to be wary of the angel and obey God. If the people obey God, then God will be an enemy to their

enemies, bringing about the destruction of the people who reside in the land. In 2 Chr 32, after Sennacherib taunts and threatens Jerusalem, Hezekiah and Isaiah pray to God. Second Chronicles 32:21 reports that YHWH sent his angel and effaced the Assyrian army. A conceptual connection between the passages is the establishment of feasts before the promise of God sending an angel (Exod 23:14-17) and the reestablishment of the feasts before God sending an angel (2 Chr 30:13, 21-23; 31:7; cf. Klein, 2012:450).

Exod 23:20, 23

20 הִנֵּה אָנֹכִי שֹׁלֵחַ מַלְאָךְ לְפָנֶיךָ לִשְׁמָרְךָ בַּדָּרֶךְ וְלַהֲבִיאֲךָ אֶל־הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר הֲכִנֹתִי׃

23 כִּי־יֵלֵךְ מַלְאָכִי לְפָנֶיךָ וֶהֱבִיאֲךָ אֶל־הָאֱמֹרִי וְהַחִתִּי וְהַפְּרִזִּי וְהַכְּנַעֲנִי הַחִוִּי וְהַיְבוּסִי וְהִכְחַדְתִּיו׃

2 Chr 32:21a

וַיִּשְׁלַח יְהוָה מַלְאָךְ וַיַּכְחֵד כָּל־גִּבּוֹר חַיִל וְנָגִיד וְשָׂר בְּמַחֲנֵה מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר

Though there are parallel accounts of this narrative in 2 Kgs 19 // Isa 37, and more specifically parallels of 2 Chr 32:21 in 2 Kgs 19:35-37 // Isa 37:36-38, the Chronicler has deviated from his sources and used language unique to his own account (including the use of כחד in place of נכה; see Klein, 2006:37 n. 267; 2012:457, 466; Japhet, 1993:989; Evans, 2013a:107). This potential allusion is exclusive to the Chronicler.

*Coherence*. The coherence of these passages indicates that 2 Chr 32:21 is the alluding text and Exod 23:20, 23 the evoked text. Regarding internal coherence, we observe a more specific listing in 2 Chr 32:21, indicating it is the alluding text (cf. Carr, 2001:111). Whereas the enemies are declared to be entire people groups in Exod 32:23, the enemies in 2 Chr 32:21 are specific elements of the Assyrian army. The enemy is not listed as "the Assyrians" but rather "every mighty one of strength, officer, and commander in the camp of the king of Assyria" ( כָּל־גִּבּוֹר חַיִל וְנָגִיד וְשָׂר בְּמַחֲנֵה מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר). Regarding external coherence, it would make more sense for the Chronicler to adapt a promise of victory to a new enemy in fulfilling that promise rather than the author of Exodus to retrofit the victory into a promise against entirely different people groups.

*Use*. Japhet attributes the changes from Kings by the Chronicler—the contraction of three verses into one, including the omission of numerical, chronological, and genealogical details—to "the Chronicler anticipat[ing] modern rationalistic reservation" (1993:991). However, we argue that the Chronicler has made these changes to his *Vorlage* to allude to Exod 23:20, 23. By alluding to

Exod 23 here, the Chronicler demonstrates that the Assyrian army's destruction is a fulfillment of God's promised deliverance. The messengers of Sennacherib use the verb נצל ('to deliver') eight times.[182] Each time they question God's ability to deliver his people. The Chronicler provides a resounding answer through his allusion to Exod 23:20, 23. Yes, God can and does deliver from the hands of enemies (narrated rather succinctly in one verse), so much so that he even fulfills promises of deliverance from long ago.

*Recurrence*. This study did not find another instance of an allusion to Exod 23:20, 23. There is one other instance in Chronicles of God sending an angel to destroy: 1 Chr 21:15. However, that instance is God's punishment for David's sinful census and lacks the key lexical term noted above (כחד), so we do not see the passage alluding to Exod 23.

*Holistic Interpretation*. The promise of deliverance in Exod 23 was predicated upon Israel's obedience (Exod 23:21-22). In their moment of need, Hezekiah and Isaiah pray to God and cry out (זעק; cf. 2 Chr 20:9 where such crying out is shown to be positive). Further, the reader of Chronicles has already seen evidence in 2 Chr 29-31 of Hezekiah's obedience, including the reestablishment of the feasts mentioned in Exod 23:14-17.[183] Though the opponent has changed, the Chronicler confirms through his allusion Hezekiah's previous and present actions as obedience because those actions lead to God's honoring of a long-standing promise to the people of Israel. Thus, we see this allusion exhibits a fulfillment of one of God's promises, and, indirectly, moral evaluation of Hezekiah and Isaiah.

*Reciprocation*. The reader of Exod 23 sees a promise of victory in the midst of directives requiring obedience. The promised victory is not fully brought about in the conquest narrative of Joshua nor in the time of the judges. This promise does not even come to fruition in the blessed monarchy of King David. Rather, with 2 Chr 32 in mind, the reader of Exod 23 finally sees the fulfillment of God's promise. It is certainly not what one would expect, but the promise is indeed fulfilled. Though it may take far longer than anticipated, the God of Israel does not leave his promises undone.

*Historical Implications*. With the allusion to Exod 23:20, 23 in 2 Chr 32:21, the Chronicler demonstrates a hermeneutic not yet encountered in this study. The Chronicler portrays Judah's

---

[182] 2 Chr 32:11, 13, 14 (x2), 15 (x2), 17 (x2).

[183] Even Sennacherib's messengers highlight Hezekiah's past obedience to God in 2 Chr 32:12. The messengers recount Hezekiah's actions as an intended insult, yet the reader of Chronicles who is familiar with the Torah understands Hezekiah's actions in a positive light. Cf. Klein (2012:463-464).

deliverance from Assyria as a (or the?) fulfillment of the promise of God in Exod 23 to send an angel to remove the Canaanites (cf. Exod 33:2). This fulfillment did not come in the time of the conquest narratives as one might have expected, but many centuries later in the divided kingdom. The enemies mentioned in Exod 23:21 are various Canaanite people groups. In 2 Chr 32, the enemy is the Assyrian army. The vanquished enemies were not those specified in Exod 23:23, and yet somehow, the promise stands fulfilled. The Chronicler is not only providing a moral evaluation based on the Torah but interpreting a promise in the HB/OT as fulfilled. The Chronicler demonstrates here historiographical and exegetical assessment in his allusion to Exodus (cf. Evans 2013a:120; Jonker, 2011a:142; Willi, 1972:53-66, 204-215).

### 3.2.14 – 2 Chr 34:4-7

King Josiah enters the Chronicler's narrative in 2 Chr 34. Josiah's reign begins with him as a young man following God and leading a series of reforms that cleanses his country and capital.

*Marker Identification*. The terms שׂרף (‘to burn’) and דקק (‘to crush’) only appear within one verse of each other in six passages in the HB/OT: Exod 32:20; Deut 9:21; 2 Kgs 23:6, 15-16; 2 Chr 15:16; 34:4-5. Second Chronicles 15:16 is discussed further below (see *Recurrence*). There are strong lexical connections between Exod 32:20; Deut 9:21; and 2 Chr 34:4-5. An initial observation inclines the reader to see a stronger connection in 2 Chr 34:4-5 to Exod 32:20 because of the presence of וַיִּזְרֹק עַל־פְּנֵי (‘and he scattered on the face of’) in 2 Chr 34:4 (cf. וַיִּזֶּר עַל־פְּנֵי, ‘and he scattered on the face of’ in Exod 32:20). However, if we extend the literary contexts just a little and include 2 Chr 34:7, we see a further connection between 2 Chr 34:4-7 and Deut 9:21 with the mutual use of the verb כתת (‘to beat, to crush’). The general contexts of these three are similar; each features a godly man destroying an idol made by others. Exodus 32:20 narrates in the third person Moses' destruction of the calf idol. Deuteronomy 9:21 is the first-person narration of the same event. Second Chronicles 34:4-7 details King Josiah's destruction of the idols and pagan altars built previously. We thus see 2 Chr 34:4-7 as potentially alluding to both Exod 32:20 and Deut 9:21. The lexical connections between 2 Chr 34:4-5, 7; Exod 32:20; and Deut 9:21 are shown further below. The narrative in 2 Chr 34 does have a parallel account in 2 Kgs 22-23 but shows significant reworking by the Chronicler and additional material different from the Kings account (cf. Klein, 2012:499-502; Hicks, 2001:509; Jonker, 2013a:286-288). There is no parallel in 2 Kings for 2 Chr 34:4-7. The potential allusion here is unique to the Chronicler.

2 Chr 34:4-5, 7

4 וַיְנַתְּצוּ לְפָנָיו אֵת מִזְבְּחוֹת הַבְּעָלִים וְהַחַמָּנִים אֲשֶׁר־לְמַעְלָה מֵעֲלֵיהֶם גִּדֵּעַ וְהָאֲשֵׁרִים וְהַפְּסִלִים
וְהַמַּסֵּכוֹת שִׁבַּר וְהֵדַק וַיִּזְרֹק עַל־פְּנֵי הַקִּבְרִים הַזֹּבְחִים לָהֶם׃
5 וְעַצְמוֹת כֹּהֲנִים שָׂרַף עַל־מִזְבְּחוֹתָם וַיְטַהֵר אֶת־יְהוּדָה וְאֶת־יְרוּשָׁלִָם׃
7 וַיְנַתֵּץ אֶת־הַמִּזְבְּחוֹת וְאֶת־הָאֲשֵׁרִים וְהַפְּסִלִים כִּתַּת לְהֵדַק וְכָל־הַחַמָּנִים גִּדַּע בְּכָל־אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל
וַיָּשָׁב לִירוּשָׁלִָם׃

Exod 32:20

וַיִּקַּח אֶת־הָעֵגֶל אֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּ וַיִּשְׂרֹף בָּאֵשׁ וַיִּטְחַן עַד אֲשֶׁר־דָּק וַיִּזֶּר עַל־פְּנֵי הַמַּיִם וַיַּשְׁקְ אֶת־בְּנֵי
יִשְׂרָאֵל׃

Deut 9:21

וְאֶת־חַטַּאתְכֶם אֲשֶׁר־עֲשִׂיתֶם אֶת־הָעֵגֶל לָקַחְתִּי וָאֶשְׂרֹף אֹתוֹ בָּאֵשׁ וָאֶכֹּת אֹתוֹ טָחוֹן הֵיטֵב עַד
אֲשֶׁר־דַּק לְעָפָר וָאַשְׁלִךְ אֶת־עֲפָרוֹ אֶל־הַנַּחַל הַיֹּרֵד מִן־הָהָר׃

*Coherence*. The internal coherence of Exod 32:20 (with Deut 9:21) and 2 Chr 34:4-7 offers a slight indication that 2 Chr 34:4-7 is the alluding text. Second Chronicles 34:4-5 provides two examples of elaboration and specification (cf. Carr, 2001:110-111). Both Exod 32:20 and 2 Chr 34:4 indicate the subject of the verb scatters the ground-up remains of the idol(s) on the face of the water (הַמַּיִם, Exod 32:20) or the tombs of those who had sacrificed to them (הַקִּבְרִים הַזֹּבְחִים לָהֶם, 2 Chr 34:4). Both locative objects were previously undiscussed in each narrative. However, the object in 2 Chr 34:4 is more elaborate. The Chronicler could have just said “tombs”, but he chose to elaborate to indicate “[t]he retribution is immediate and specific” (Klein, 2012:497). The second example is the object of the verb שׂרף in 2 Chr 34:5. In Exod 32:20, the object of this verb is not specific and is implied from the context (וַיִּשְׂרֹף בָּאֵשׁ). In Deut 9:21, the object of this verb is indicated with a suffix on the direct object marker (וָאֶשְׂרֹף אֹתוֹ בָּאֵשׁ). In 2 Chr 34:5, the object is clearly specified and placed before the verb in a case of marked word order ( וְעַצְמוֹת כֹּהֲנִים שָׂרַף עַל־מִזְבְּחוֹתָם).

The external coherence of these three passages inclines the reader to see Exod 32 and Deut 9 as the evoked texts and 2 Chr 34 as the alluding text. We have in Exod 32 (and the accompanying first-person account in Deut 9) one of the pre-eminent and godly figures of the HB/OT rebuking and correcting the iconic sin of God’s people by destroying an idol made by his brother after this figure

had just interacted directly with God. In 2 Chr 34, one of several morally good kings listed in the book of Chronicles responds to one of God's prophet's exhortation to obedience. This king's laudable actions include the destruction of idols and pagan altars made by others. Certainly, there are parallels in either direction, but it makes more sense for the "lesser" King Josiah (as good as he was) to be compared to the "greater" Moses rather than the reverse. If Moses is compared to Josiah, it ultimately diminishes Moses. If Josiah is compared to Moses, it elevates Josiah.

*Use*. Just as the Chronicler has adapted his source text of 2 Kings "to demonstrate the piety of Josiah" (Hicks, 2001:513), the Chronicler has alluded to Exod 32:20 (and Deut 9:21) to show how Josiah's righteous reaction to the idolatry around him was just like Moses' reaction at Mt. Sinai. Through the allusion, the Chronicler has provided a positive moral evaluation of Josiah, comparing him to one of the foremost heroes of the HB/OT. This fits the pattern observed by Ristau: "Josiah variously embodies the characters and authority of Moses, David, Solomon, and Hezekiah" (2009:230).

*Recurrence*. The Chronicler alludes to Exod 32 multiple times throughout his narrative (see 3.2.9, 3.2.10, 3.2.12), but there is a connection to Exod 32:20 elsewhere in 2 Chronicles only in 2 Chr 15:16. The question is whether the literary connection in 2 Chr 15:16 is tied to Exod 32:20; Deut 9:21; or potentially both. The three terms עשׂה, שׂרף, and דקק only appear together in four verses in the HB/OT, 2 Chr 15:16; Exod 32:20; Deut 9:21; and 2 Kgs 23:15. The focus in the latter verse is on Josiah's destruction of the altar and high place at Bethel (places where idols would be located) rather than the destruction of an idol itself like in Exod 32:20 and Deut 9:21.[184] Therefore, we do not see it as a potentially evoked text for 2 Chr 15:16. The general contexts of the remaining three are similar; each features a godly man destroying an idol made by another. Exodus 32:20 narrates in the third person Moses' destruction of the calf idol. Deuteronomy 9:21 is the first-person narration of the same event. Second Chronicles 15:16 tells of King Asa destroying his mother's idol. The strong lexical connections between 2 Chr 15:16; Exod 32:20; and Deut 9:21 are as follows:

[184] The author of Kings indicates an emphasis on location in 2 Kgs 23:15 by using 'altar' (מִזְבֵּחַ) twice and 'high place' (בָּמָה) three times.

| Deut 9:21[185] | Exod 32:20 | 2 Chr 15:16 |
|---|---|---|
| | | וְגַם־מַעֲכָה אֵם אָסָא הַמֶּלֶךְ |
| וְאֶת־חַטַּאתְכֶם | וַיִּקַּח אֶת־הָעֵגֶל | הֵסִירָה מִגְּבִירָה |
| אֲשֶׁר־עֲשִׂיתֶם אֶת־הָעֵגֶל לָקַחְתִּי | אֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּ | אֲשֶׁר־עָשְׂתָה |
| וָאֶשְׂרֹף אֹתוֹ בָּאֵשׁ | וַיִּשְׂרֹף בָּאֵשׁ | לַאֲשֵׁרָה מִפְלָצֶת |
| וָאֶכֹּת אֹתוֹ טָחוֹן הֵיטֵב | וַיִּטְחַן | וַיְכָרֹת אָסָא אֶת־מִפְלַצְתָּהּ |
| עַד אֲשֶׁר־דַּק לְעָפָר | עַד אֲשֶׁר־דָּק | וַיָּדֶק |
| וָאַשְׁלִךְ אֶת־עֲפָרוֹ | וַיִּזֶר עַל־פְּנֵי הַמַּיִם | וַיִּשְׂרֹף |
| אֶל־הַנַּחַל הַיֹּרֵד מִן־הָהָר: | וַיַּשְׁקְ אֶת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל: | בְּנַחַל קִדְרוֹן: |

The inclusion of the rare verb דקק in 2 Chr 15:16 indicates a reworking of the source text, 1 Kgs 15:13, by the Chronicler, creating a clear connection to the Pentateuch rather than merely copying his source.[186] First Kings 15:13 does not appear to allude to a particular pentateuchal text.[187] That said, the use of the word נַחַל (‘valley, brook, wadi’) in 2 Chr 15:16 is of interest. That word appears in Deut 9:21 but does not in Exod 32:20, which instead references ‘the waters’ (הַמַּיִם). Its use in Deut 9:21 could incline one to see that passage as being the evoked text for this potential allusion. If Deut 9:21 is the exclusively evoked text for the alluding text of 2 Chr 15:16, it would make sense that the Chronicler would use נַחַל to provide the setting for Asa’s actions.

However, there is another option to explain the word’s presence. The exact phrase בְּנַחַל קִדְרוֹן appears in 1 Kgs 15:13 in the same position as it does in 2 Chr 15:16. Additionally, of the eleven

[185] Connections in all three passages are indicated with ☐. Connections between Exod 32:20 and Deut 9:21 only are indicated with ☐. Connections between 2 Chr 15:16 and Deut 9:21 are indicated with ☐.

[186] One also observes in 2 Chr 15:16 the omission of the direct object marker and the third masculine singular suffix from אֵם, the addition of ‘King Asa’ (אָסָא הַמֶּלֶךְ), the spelling change on the verb סור, and the word order reversal of לַאֲשֵׁרָה מִפְלָצֶת.

[187] The verb דקק is not used in 1 Kgs 15:13; it appears in the HB/OT only thirteen times: Exod 30:36; 32:20; Deut 9:21; 2 Sam 22:43; 2 Kgs 23:6, 15; 2 Chr 15:16; 34:4, 7; Isa 28:28 (x2); 41:15; Mic 4:13. First Kings 15:13 does share lexical terms with Deut 7:5; 9:21; and 12:31, but none of the lexical connections consists of unique language or phrases that might distinguish it as a connection.

times ‘Kidron’ (קִדְרוֹן) is used in the HB/OT, it is immediately preceded by נַחַל ten times.[188] Regardless of which of the two texts (or both) we identify as the evoked text, the inclusion of בְּנַחַל קִדְרוֹן in 2 Chr 15:16 could be explained by the Chronicler following his source text at that point in the verse with its known phrase נַחַל קִדְרוֹן.

With (potentially) equal lexical connections between the above texts, we consider other factors. We have already seen how the Chronicler has alluded to Exod 32:20 and Deut 9:21 in 2 Chr 34:4-7.[189] That observation is a *potential* argument for Deut 9:21 as the sole evoked text in 2 Chr 15:16, but it is not conclusive.[190] Without a conclusive argument for Deut 9:21 and the allusion to Exod 32:20 and Deut 9:21 elsewhere in 2 Chronicles, we proceed in seeing both Exod 32:20 and Deut 9:21 as the potentially evoked texts for 2 Chr 15:16.[191]

Next, we consider the use of this recurrent allusion. Like in 2 Chr 34, the Chronicler indicates with his allusion in 2 Chr 15:16 to both Exod 32 and Deut 9 that King Asa is following in the footsteps of Moses. This aligns with the Chronicler’s intended result for his narration of Asa’s removal of Maacah. “The effect… is to portray this drastic action as one more manifestation of the on-going Torah piety required of God’s people and exhibited in Asa’s response to Azariah’s preaching. Seeking Yahweh means placing Torah loyalty even above family loyalty” (Steiner, 1992:208).

*Holistic Interpretation*. The Chronicler is consistent in his use of this allusion to Exod 32:20 and Deut 9:21. He compares both King Asa and King Josiah to Moses and provides a positive moral evaluation of each king. Each king receives a similar initial positive evaluation by the Chronicler (cf. 2 Chr 14:1-5[2-6]; 34:2-3) at the beginning of their respective narratives. The

---

[188] The phrase ‘in the fields of Kidron’ (בְּשַׁדְמוֹת קִדְרוֹן) is used in 2 Kgs 23:4. Of the ten times in the HB/OT the phrase נַחַל קִדְרוֹן appears, בְּנַחַל קִדְרוֹן is used four times.

[189] We note again that recurrent allusions need not be as strong (see 2.3.5).

[190] This literary connection differs from the second false positive example in 3.1.2.3 (2 Chr 33:3-9); the lexical similarities in the immediate context there to Deut 5, along with the presence of multiple surrounding allusions to Deuteronomy, present a much stronger case for an evoked text in Deuteronomy in the alluding text of 2 Chr 33:3-9.

[191] We also note the lexical connections between Exod 32:20 and Deut 9:21 aside from those they share with 2 Chr 15:16. The phrases בָּאֵשׁ and אֶת־הָעֵגֶל + לקח and the verb טחן all appear in Exod 32:20 and Deut 9:21. With a brief synchronic evaluation, we tentatively understand the lengthened descriptions in Deut 9:21 (identifying the calf as ‘your sinful thing’ (חַטַּאתְכֶם); טָחוֹן הֵיטֵב instead of וַיִּטְחַן) to indicate that Deut 9:21 is building upon, and thus alluding to, Exod 32:20.

Chronicler then proceeds to provide examples to support those positive evaluations and uses this allusive comparison to Moses as one of those examples.

*Reciprocation*. When one considers other allusions to Exod 32 by the Chronicler (cf. 3.2.9, 3.2.10, 3.2.12), those allusions' emphases include a negative moral evaluation of the people. When the reader of Exod 32 thinks of those related passages, they can be reminded of future generations' sins. However, instead of focusing on the people's sin like in those other passages, this allusion focuses primarily on positive evaluations of Kings Asa and Josiah. The reader of Exod 32:20 (and Deut 9:21) can then be reminded of future leaders of God's people who will similarly uphold the commands of God and be encouraged that Moses is not the last good leader of Israel.

*Historical Implications*. The Chronicler evidences another example of his (and thus his community's; cf. Ristau, 2009:240) respect for the book of Exodus and the narration of Israel's time at Sinai. The Chronicler has alluded to the episode of Exod 32 multiple times for both negative and positive moral evaluations. The Chronicler views the episode as instructive for his audience in multiple ways. The story of Israel's sin and Moses' righteous response is not just ancient history but valued as relevant for their descendants even now. They would do well to follow Moses' and Josiah's example.

### 3.2.15 – 2 Chr 35:13

The story of King Josiah continues in 2 Chr 35. The Chronicler narrates the second Passover to occur in Chronicles. Since the topic is Passover, it is not surprising that a reference to the first Passover in Exod 12 occurs. However, the reference provides a perhaps unexpected result.

*Marker Identification*. The words פֶּסַח ('Passover') and בשׁל ('to boil/cook') appear within two verses of each other in four places in the HB/OT: Exod 12:9-11; 34:25-26; Deut 16:5-7; and 2 Chr 35:13. The stipulations and practice of the Passover are the sole focus of Exod 12:9-11; Deut 16:5-7; and 2 Chr 35:13; Exod 34:25-26 does not solely focus on the Passover.[192] Thus we concern ourselves only with the former three. The general themes and content of 2 Chr 35 have parallels in 2 Kgs 23, but the Chronicler has significantly reworked the material. Specifically, there is no parallel in 2 Kgs 23 to 2 Chr 35:13; any potential allusion there is unique to the Chronicler.

*Coherence*. The internal and external coherence of these passages points to 2 Chr 35:13 as the alluding text. While the grammar and syntax of 2 Chr 35:13 may suggest an allusive nature for the

[192] Exodus 34:25 does discuss the Passover, but Exod 34:26 changes topics and addresses other parts of the renewed covenant. The use of בשׁל in Exod 34:26 does not concern the Passover.

verse,[193] the use of כַּמִּשְׁפָּט (‘according to the judgment’) certainly does. These characteristics of 2 Chr 35:13 point elsewhere for referents, thus reducing the likelihood that Exod 12:9 and Deut 16:7 allude to 2 Chr 35:13. Both Exod 12:9 and Deut 16:7 seem to establish different regulations regarding the same activity; 2 Chr 35:13 refers to their adherence. Therefore, it seems more sensible that a positive evaluation for adherence to combined regulations was written after the regulations themselves rather than the separate regulations being written in divergent ways after a practice was established.

*Use*. The ultimate use of the allusion to Exod 12:9 and Deut 16:7 in 2 Chr 35:13 is to provide a positive moral evaluation of the Passover practices done under King Josiah and thus provide another positive moral evaluation of the king himself (cf. 3.2.14).[194] The reminders that the activities of the Josianic Passover happened “as written in the scroll of Moses” (2 Chr 35:12) and “according to the judgment” (2 Chr 35:13) indicate that the Chronicler wanted to emphasize the Torah adherence present in this Passover. However, the means by which the Chronicler arrives at that evaluation is why this particular allusion has received so much attention in scholarship (cf., Ben Zvi, 2006:239; Knoppers, 2012:326).

How one understands an allusion in 2 Chr 35:13 to Exod 12:9 and Deut 16:7 hinges on how one understands the semantic range of בשׁל and its specific application in each of the three texts. The term is not common in the HB/OT, appearing twice as an adjective and twenty-eight times as a verb; as a verb, it typically means ‘to cook’ or ‘to boil’ in the *Qal*, *Piel*, or *Pual*; in the *Hiphil*, it means ‘to ripen’.[195] The use in Exod 12:9 is ‘to boil’ since the liquid in which this cooking is to take

---

[193] Japhet calls “‘cook with fire’ (*way$^{e}$baššelū bā’ēš*)” an “awkward phrase” (1993:1053). Knoppers writes, “That the narrator has earlier legal precedent in view is quite evident in his earlier generalization that ‘they,’ that is, the priests assisted by the Levites, prepared the sacrifices to YHWH ‘as written in the scroll of Moses’ (ככתוב בספר משה; 2 Chr 35:12)” (2012:326).

[194] We note, though, that this positive moral evaluation of Josiah only plays a part in the Chronicler’s Passover narrative here. The overall emphasis in the Chronicler’s account of Josiah’s Passover is well summarized by Jonker: “In the Chronistic account, however, reference is made to King Josiah’s deeds in order to accentuate the celebration of the Passover. King Josiah is therefore *instrumentalized* rather than *idealized*. The Chronistic narrative portrays Josiah being instrumental to the first and real celebration of the Passover” (2003:33; emphasis original; cf. Ben Zvi, 2006:239-240, 245).

[195] As an adjective: Exod 12:9; Num 6:19. Cf. Childs (1974:182-183) who reads וּבָשֵׁל in Exod 12:9 as an infinitive absolute rather than an adjective. As a verb, we break down the occurrences by their respective stems. In the *Qal*: Ezek 24:5; Joel 4:13(3:13; the preferred translation here relates more to the ‘ripen’ meaning of the *Hiphil* since the subject is קָצִיר, ‘harvest’). In the *Piel*: Exod 16:23 (x2); 23:19; 29:31; 34:26; Lev 8:31; Num 11:8; Deut 14:21; 16:7; 1 Sam 2:13; 2 Sam 13:8; 1 Kgs 19:21; 2 Kgs 4:38; 6:29; 2 Chr 35:13 (x2); Lam 4:10; Ezek 46:20; 46:24 (x2); Zech 14:21. In the *Pual*: Exod 12:9; Lev 6:21(28) (x2); 1 Sam 2:15. In the *Hiphil*: Gen 40:10.

place is specified (בַּמַּיִם, water).[196] The use in 2 Chr 35:13 relates to the use of fire since the phrase ends with בָּאֵשׁ ('with/in fire'). In whatever way one understands and translates בשׁל here in 2 Chr 35:13, the practice must have been more akin to roasting rather than boiling since the element of fire is specified. Ben Zvi outlines four reasons why it is not likely that בשׁל in Deut 16:7 is to be understood as 'to cook' rather than 'to boil' (2006:240-241). We agree with his conclusions.[197]

With 'to boil' as the semantic idea of בשׁל operating in Exod 12:9 ("Do not eat any from it raw or boiled in water") and in Deut 16:7 ("And you shall boil and eat it"), how then do we understand its use in 2 Chr 35:13? Again, we turn to Ben Zvi. After outlining why three "surface" possibilities for how to read the phrase in question are deemed unsatisfactory (2006:242-244), Ben Zvi argues convincingly for the implementation of a sophisticated exegetical technique by the Chronicler that

> expands the semantic meaning of "boil" to include not only boiling in water or milk, but also boiling in fire, which in practice is roasting, that is, that which is prescribed in Exod 12:9 and the actual halacha of his period. Thus, not only is the Chronicler able to fulfill at the same time all the prescriptions of the relevant texts and uphold the rituals celebrated in the temple along with the implications of these issues…, but also to advance the case that he is providing the true meaning of the relevant verses to begin with (244; cf. 249).

By alluding to Exod 12 and Deut 16, not only has the Chronicler shown Josiah to be a faithful follower of the Torah in this Passover, but the Chronicler has given his readers the right understanding of both pentateuchal texts in question.

*Recurrence*. This study did not find additional allusions to Exod 12 by the Chronicler.

---

[196] The liquid in which the food is cooked is also specified in Exod 23:19 (milk); 34:26 (milk); Deut 14:21 (milk); and Ezek 24:3-5 (water).

[197] Ben Zvi's first reason regards the likelihood of the meaning of בשׁל in Deut 16:7. Our research agrees with his conclusion. See the previous note regarding the clearest examples of בשׁל meaning 'to boil'. The following uses of בשׁל do not specify a liquid in which the cooking takes place, but the context argues strongly for 'to boil': Lev 6:21(28); 1 Sam 2:13, 15; 2 Kgs 4:38; Zech 14:21. Numbers 11:8 specifies that the cooking takes place in a pot (פָּרוּר), but the object being cooked is manna, so a 'to boil' idea is curious at best. So also with 2 Sam 13:8 as the food in question is bread. As stated above, 2 Chr 35:13 communicates a practice closer to roasting with its phrase בָּאֵשׁ. The context of the following uses does not specifically note or necessarily require a boiling practice, but the idea of 'to boil' is certainly possible if not probable (given the main types of cooking in ancient Israel; cf. Ben Zvi, 2006:241, esp. n. 16): Exod 16:23; 29:31; Lev 8:31; Num 6:19; Deut 16:7; 1 Kgs 19:21; 2 Kgs 6:29; Lam 4:10; Ezek 46:20, 24.

*Holistic Interpretation*. We do see a moral evaluation of the Passover procedure under Josiah; those responsible for its practice during his reign have adhered to the Torah and thus can be understood in a positive light. However, the striking element of the allusion here is not that the priests and Levites in Josiah's reign followed the Torah but that the Chronicler has resolved a (perceived?) disagreement in the Pentateuch with his interpretation of the relevant texts.

*Reciprocation*. The reader of Exod 12 who has 2 Chr 35 in mind, regardless of how the use of בשׁל is perceived in each context, does see a continuity between the stipulation and its application. Exodus 12:9 commands that the Passover meat shall not be cooked *in water* but roasted *with fire* (בַּמַּ֥יִם כִּי אִם־צְלִי־אֵ֖שׁ). Though it does not use צָלִי (‘roasted’), 2 Chr 35:13 specifies that the Passover meat was cooked *in fire* (בָּאֵ֑שׁ). Though the setting is different (wilderness in Exodus vs. temple in 2 Chr 35), the reader of Exodus is reminded of an example of later generations following a pre-temple (and even pre-tabernacle) command and thus sees the regulation taken as not just specific to the flight context of Exodus but as a lasting ordinance (cf. Hicks, 2001:524; Johnstone, 1997b:253; Ben Zvi, 2006:246-249, esp. 248).

*Historical Implications*. The allusion here yields significant historical implications. We observe the Chronicler taking two pentateuchal texts and harmonizing them to either inform or represent the practice in Josiah's reign. The Chronicler has intertwined and adhered to two different pentateuchal legal traditions (Jonker, 2013a:300).[198] This is the reapplication of the HB/OT within the HB/OT. We have seen the Chronicler hold the HB/OT in high regard with his various allusions to Exodus. Now we see him take what is revered and apply it to his narrative context.[199]

> This need to show congruity between the two requirements reflects and shapes a unified approach to preceding authoritative texts… Thus, it is this unified (and unifying) understanding that qualifies as הַמִּשְׁפָּט, that is, the accepted norm… In this particular case, Chronicles teaches its primary readership about the actual meaning of the prescriptions communicated to the same readership by both Exod 12:9 and Deut 16:7 (Ben Zvi, 2006:238-239).

---

[198] Cf. 3.2.3, *Historical Implications*.

[199] Cf. 3.2.7, *Historical Implications* and Schweitzer (2011:41).

This also implies a primary readership who would have understood such an exegetical technique (245).[200]

## 3.3 – Conclusion

This chapter addressed the first primary question of the study: Where, how, and for what purpose(s) does the Chronicler reference the book of Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36? The chapter identified the Chronicler's allusions in 2 Chr 10-36 to the book of Exodus, assessed the nature of those allusions, and evaluated the rhetorical argument(s) motivating the allusions. The chapter began with a specific discussion on how this study found the allusions and how we evaluate the *Dating* step for most of the allusions. We then discussed examples of different types of false positives discovered in the research: Rare Lexical Matches, Appeal to General Concept, Stronger Sources Elsewhere, and Reference to Intermediate Source. The chapter then proceeded through the methodological steps outlined above in 2.3 for each identified allusive passage: 2 Chr 10:4-16; 16:14; 19:10; 20:3-29; 21:14; 22:11; 24:6-12; 26:16-21; 27:2; 28:19; 29:31; 30:6-9; 32:21; 34:4-7; 35:13.

In the following chapter, we will review the author's purposes for using the allusions to Exodus examined in this chapter and categorize them, noting patterns or themes that arise.

[200] Ben Zvi (2006:246) provides two further examples of the Chronicler utilizing this type of exegesis (Num 4:3 and 1 Chr 23:24-27; Exod 25:32 and 1 Chr 4:7, 20).

# Chapter 4 – Inner-Biblical Allusions to Exodus: Results

## 4.1 – Introduction

This study seeks to answer the following principal questions: Where, how, and for what purpose(s) does the Chronicler reference the book of Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36? How does the Chronicler's use of Exodus impact his rhetorical argument(s) in that part of the narrative? Chapter 2 addressed underlying methodological issues related to these principal questions. Chapter 3 identified the Chronicler's allusions in 2 Chr 10-36 to the book of Exodus, assessed the nature of those allusions, and evaluated the rhetorical arguments motivating the allusions by using the methodological steps outlined in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 addressed the first primary question above: Where, how, and for what purpose(s) does the Chronicler reference the book of Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36? This chapter reviews and summarizes the inner-biblical allusions to Exodus examined in Chapter 3 and categorizes them according to their patterns and themes, especially the allusions' uses. Chapter 5 will address the second principal question above.

## 4.2 – Overview

The study examined in the previous chapter sixteen inner-biblical allusions from 2 Chr 10-36 to the book of Exodus. Eight of these allusions include fourteen recurrences in total, making for thirty alluding texts examined overall. The alluding texts from Chronicles are as follows:

| Section | 2 Chronicles Text | Recurrence(s) |
|---|---|---|
| 3.2.1 | 10:4-16 | 2 Chr 25:16-20; 35:22 |
| 3.2.2 | 16:14 | 1 Chr 9:30 |
| 3.2.3 | 19:10 | 2 Chr 17:7-9 |
| 3.2.4 | 20:3-29 | - |
| 3.2.5 | 21:14 | 1 Chr 21:17 |
| 3.2.6 | 22:11 | - |
| 3.2.7 | 24:6-12 | 1 Chr 29:7; 2 Chr 34:8-14 |
| 3.2.8a | 26:16-21 | 1 Chr 6:34(49); 2 Chr 2:2-3(3-4); 13:11; 29:7 |
| 3.2.8b | 26:19-20 | - |
| 3.2.9 | 27:2 | - |
| 3.2.10 | 28:19 | - |
| 3.2.11 | 29:31 | - |
| 3.2.12 | 30:6-9 | 2 Chr 29:10; 36:13 |
| 3.2.13 | 32:21 | - |
| 3.2.14 | 34:4-7 | 2 Chr 15:16 |
| 3.2.15 | 35:13 | - |

Table 1 – Examined Alluding Texts and Their Recurrences

The primary evoked texts from Exodus (and their co-evoked texts)[1] and the secondary evoked texts are as follows:

| Section | Primary Evoked Text(s) from Exodus | Co-evoked Text | Secondary Evoked Text(s) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3.2.1 | 1:14; 6:9 | - | Exod 1:11-13; 2:23; 5:9, 11, 18; 6:5-6; 7:4, 13, 16, 22; 8:11(15), 15(19); 9:12; 11:9 |
| 3.2.2 | 30:25 | - | - |
| 3.2.3 | 18:20 | - | - |
| 3.2.4 | 14:13 | - | Exod 14:10, 14, 25 |
| 3.2.5 | 9:14 | - | Exod 7:27(8:2); 12:13, 23, 27 |
| 3.2.6 | 2:7 | - | Exod 2:4-5, 8-10 |
| 3.2.7 | 30:11-16 | - | - |
| 3.2.8a | 30:7-8 | Num 17:5(16:40) | Exod 40:26-27 |
| 3.2.8b | 28:36-38 | - | - |
| 3.2.9 | 32:7 | Deut 9:12 | - |
| 3.2.10 | 32:25 | - | - |
| 3.2.11 | 35:5, 22 | - | - |
| 3.2.12 | 32:8-13 | Neh 9:16-19, 26-32 | - |
| 3.2.13 | 23:20-23 | - | - |
| 3.2.14 | 32:20 | Deut 9:21 | - |
| 3.2.15 | 12:9-11 | Deut 16:7 | - |

Table 2 – Examined Evoked Texts[2]

We see that the allusions to Exodus (including recurrences) are spread evenly throughout 2 Chr 10-36; there is an allusion to Exodus in twenty of the twenty-seven chapters of our study.[3] Five of the recurrences occur outside of 2 Chr 10-36.[4] The evoked texts in Exodus are not spread as evenly as the alluding texts are in Chronicles. Only twelve of Exodus's forty chapters include a primary evoked text.[5] If we integrate the secondary evoked texts, only four additional chapters of Exodus (for a total of sixteen) are represented.[6] We note that three primary evoked texts are from Exod 30 and that four primary evoked texts are from Exod 32. There are five co-evocations; four of them are from the Pentateuch, with three from Deuteronomy.[7]

---

[1] We give the label "co-evocation" or "co-evoked" to an evoked text outside of Exodus that has lexical parallels with an evoked text from Exodus when it appears both are being evoked by the text from Chronicles.

[2] Tables 1 and 2 are combined in Appendix B.

[3] Each chapter of 2 Chr 10-36 is represented except for chapters 11; 12; 14; 18; 23; 31; and 33. See Appendix B.2.

[4] 1 Chr 6:34(49); 9:30; 21:17; 29:7; 2 Chr 2:2-3(3-4).

[5] Exod 1; 2; 6; 9; 12; 14; 18; 23; 28; 30; 32; 35. See Appendix B.3.

[6] Exod 1; 2; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; 11; 12; 14; 18; 23; 28; 30; 32; 35; 40.

[7] Num 17:5(16:40); Deut 9:12, 21; 16:7; Neh 9:16-19, 26-32.

The marker identification of the examined alluding texts reveals the Chronicler uses an assortment of markers to indicate his allusions to Exodus. The lexical markers are more varied than the conceptual or structural markers. The lexical markers include common nouns, rare nouns, common verbs, rare verbs, common noun and verbal phrases, rare combinations of words, and rare phrases.[8] The most prevalent lexical markers are rare combinations of words and rare phrases.[9] Conceptual markers appear in nineteen of the thirty examined alluding texts.[10] Fourteen of those nineteen cases display similar situations between the evoked and alluding texts.[11] In one case, the conceptual marker seems to play the dominant role in marking the allusion (2 Chr 22 alluding to Exod 2; 3.2.6). We observe only one overt structural marker (3.2.4; 2 Chr 20:3-29 alluding to Exod 14). We do not observe any overt marker differences between allusions with recurrences or allusions without recurrences.

Regarding their dating and coherence, each allusion displays consistency. The dating of Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Nehemiah, and Chronicles indicates (with varying levels of confidence) that the first four books are the evoked texts and Chronicles the alluding text. The internal and external coherence of the studied connections likewise indicates (with varying levels of strength) that the texts from Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Nehemiah are evoked while the texts from Chronicles are alluding.

## 4.3 – Allusion Uses

We now turn to analyze and summarize the focal point of our study in Chapter 3 and thus answer more clearly our first primary research question: Where, how, and for what purpose(s) does the Chronicler reference the book of Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36? In our analysis and summary provided here, we combine Step 4 (Use), Step 5 (Recurrence), and Step 6 (Holistic Interpretation) from the examination of each allusion in Chapter 3. We include here the recurrences since they do function as allusions, though the recurrences' markers may not be as strong (cf. 2.3.5). As noted above, we

---

[8] See Appendix C. We note that our methodology requires at least one lexical match so lexical markers necessarily appear in each alluding text.

[9] Rare combinations of words are used for eight of the sixteen allusions (3.2.1, 3.2.3, 3.2.7, 3.2.8 [includes a rare phrase], 3.2.12, 3.2.13, 3.2.14, 3.2.15). Including recurrences, rare combinations of words are used thirteen times (1 Chr 6:34[49]; 29:7; 2 Chr 10:4-16; 15:16; 19:10; 24:6-12; 26:16-21; 29:10; 30:6-9; 32:21; 34:4-7; 34:8-14; 35:13). Rare phrases are used for five of the sixteen allusions (3.2.4, 3.2.5, 3.2.8, 3.2.9, 3.2.11). Including recurrences, rare phrases are used eight times (1 Chr 21:17; 2 Chr 2:2-3[3-4]; 13:11; 20:3-29, 21:14; 27:2; 29:7; 29:31).

[10] 1 Chr 9:30; 21:17; 29:7; 2 Chr 10:4-16; 15:16; 17:7-9; 19:10; 20:3-29; 21:14; 22:11; 24:6-12; 27:2; 28:19; 29:31; 32:21; 34:4-7; 34:8-14; 35:13; 35:22.

[11] 1 Chr 29:7; 2 Chr 10:4-16; 15:16; 17:7-9; 19:10; 20:3-29; 21:14; 22:11; 24:6-12; 27:2; 29:31; 34:4-7; 34:8-14; 35:13.

examined sixteen inner-biblical allusions from 2 Chr 10-36 to the book of Exodus; eight of these allusions include a total of fourteen recurrences, making for thirty alluding texts examined in all.

We classify the use of allusions to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36 into the following five categories: Moral Evaluation, Elevate the Temple and Priesthood, Establish and Reaffirm a Standard or Truth, Exegesis, and Encouragement. These uses can be a primary or secondary focus of the allusion.[12] The total number of the following uses is more than thirty because the Chronicler often uses one allusion for multiple purposes (nineteen instances).[13] We enumerate the various uses in order of descending frequency. We observe only one overt difference in usage between allusions with recurrences and allusions without recurrences: allusions with recurrences establish or reaffirm a truth with much greater frequency (eight instances); we observe only one allusion without a recurrence that establishes or reaffirms a truth.

### 4.3.1 – Moral Evaluation

The Chronicler most often uses allusions to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36 to provide a moral evaluation (twenty-nine occurrences). These moral evaluations can be either positive (fifteen occurrences) or negative (fourteen occurrences). The moral evaluations happen through comparison or contrast to a character in Exodus or an appeal to some expectation or standard, most often a specific requirement of the Torah.

#### 4.3.1.1 – Positive

The Chronicler uses an allusion to Exodus to provide a positive moral evaluation fifteen times in 2 Chr 10-36. We observe ten primary and five secondary positive moral evaluations. A comparison or contrast to a character from Exodus occurs ten times. An appeal to a standard occurs five times.

The Chronicler provides positive moral evaluations in 2 Chr 10-36 by comparing his characters to Moses, Miriam, Pharaoh's daughter, and the people of Israel (in their obedience). The Chronicler also provides a positive moral evaluation of King David by contrasting David with Pharaoh. In each case, the Chronicler highlights a positive attribute or action in one of his characters by showing how they align or contrast to well-known figures from Exodus. Seven of these are primary comparisons; three are secondary. The Exodus character most often appealed to in these positive evaluations is Moses (seven times). Twice, as an explicit function of the allusion, the

---

[12] We use the terms 'primary(ly)' or 'explicit(ly)' throughout 4.3 to mean that the type of use in question appears to be a primary use of the allusion. We use the term 'secondary(-ily)' or 'implicit(ly)' throughout 4.3 to mean that the type of use in question appears to be a secondary use of the allusion.

[13] See Appendix D.

Chronicler compares King Jehoshaphat to Moses when Jehoshaphat established a way for teaching the law and set up his judicial system (2 Chr 17:7-9 and 19:10, respectively; 3.2.3). King Joash (and the beginning of his life) is implicitly and favorably compared to Moses in 2 Chr 22 (3.2.6). King Jotham is implicitly compared to Moses in 2 Chr 27:2 (3.2.9). The emphasis of this allusion in 2 Chr 27:2 is a negative comparison of the people of Judah to the people acting wildly at Sinai (see 4.3.1.2 below). However, the positive statement about Jotham in 2 Chr 27:2 allows the reader to detect an implicit comparison to Moses, the excellent leader at Sinai despite the wicked actions of the people. The Chronicler highlights through his allusion in 2 Chr 29:10 to Exod 32 (and Neh 9) how King Hezekiah's intent to make a covenant with YHWH is comparable to Moses' intercession for the people at Sinai (3.2.12; we understand this to be a primary use of the allusion). The Chronicler explicitly compares both King Josiah's and King Asa's destruction of idols to Moses' righteous actions at Sinai (2 Chr 34:4-7 and 2 Chr 15:16, respectively; 3.2.14). The heroic actions of Jehoshabeath in 2 Chr 22:11 are compared in the allusion's primary function to those of two heroines in Exod 2, Miriam and Pharaoh's daughter (3.2.6). The people of Judah are explicitly compared in 2 Chr 29:31 to the people of Israel in Exod 35; the people of Judah supplied the restoration of the temple just like the people of Israel supplied the construction of the tabernacle (3.2.11). Lastly, though the allusion in 1 Chr 21:17 is primarily about God's judgment (see 4.3.3 below), there is a secondary contrast of King David to Pharaoh (3.2.5). Pharaoh responded to God's judgment with defiant disobedience, but David responded to God's judgment with the admission of his own sin and concern for his people's well-being.

The Chronicler uses an allusion to Exodus four times to highlight a character's obedience to some aspect of the Torah; in one additional case, an allusion highlights a character following, not a specific stipulation of the Torah, but the more general practice of obeying and relying upon God. King Joash is explicitly shown to be following the Torah by his insistence on collecting the tax of Moses (2 Chr 24:6-12; 3.2.7). In 2 Chr 13:11, King Abijah explicitly highlights in his speech that the priests of Judah (and thus Judah in general) are obeying the Torah in their regular practice of priestly duties (3.2.8). The Chronicler secondarily demonstrates that Hezekiah is a follower of the Torah by his call for the cleansing of the temple and the resumption of regular priestly duties (2 Chr 29:7; 3.2.8). The allusion's primary purpose appears to be the negative evaluation of past generations (see 4.3.1.2 below), but Hezekiah is still reflected positively. The primary purpose of the allusion in 2 Chr 35:13 is to show that Josiah and the priests and Levites operating at his command follow the law (3.2.15). The Chronicler's exegesis in this verse is also of significant interest (see 4.3.4 below), but the Torah obedience by the characters in this verse is paramount (as indicated by כַּמִּשְׁפָּט, 'according to the judgment'). Lastly, King Hezekiah and Isaiah the prophet

are secondarily shown to adhere to the general (positive) principle of obedience and reliance on God (3.2.13). The prerequisite for God's promised assistance in Exod 23:22-23 is obedience. The Chronicler sees 2 Chr 32:21 as the fulfillment of the promise from Exod 23:20-23. By implication then, Hezekiah's and Isaiah's actions in 2 Chr 32:20 are to be understood as obedience.

#### 4.3.1.2 – Negative

The Chronicler uses an allusion to Exodus to provide a negative moral evaluation fourteen times in 2 Chr 10-36. The Chronicler is more explicit with negative moral evaluations than positive ones; we observe thirteen primary negative moral evaluations and one secondary (the secondary evaluation is noted below). A comparison or contrast to a character from Exodus occurs nine times. An appeal to a standard occurs five times; each time, the allusion emphasizes the character's breaking of the Torah.

The Chronicler provides negative moral evaluations by comparing his characters to Pharaoh, Aaron at Sinai, and the rebellious people of Israel (both at Sinai and once they inhabited the land). In each case, the Chronicler highlights a negative attribute or action in one of his characters by showing how they oppose God (either momentarily or as part of continual hostility and defiance) like well-known figures from Exodus. The Exodus character most often appealed to in these negative evaluations is Pharaoh (five times). Both King Rehoboam and King Amaziah exhibit Pharaoh's harshness and refusal to listen (2 Chr 10:4-16 and 25:16-20, respectively; 3.2.1). King Josiah, a good king overall, is compared to Pharaoh in his refusal to listen. In a moment of irony, the Pharaoh in Josiah's time speaks on behalf of Josiah's God, while the king of Judah stubbornly rejects the word of God like the Pharaoh from Exodus (2 Chr 35:22; 3.2.1). Because of King Jehoram's continued and manifold sins, Elijah proclaims judgment against Jehoram's people like Pharaoh and his people received in the plague narrative of Exodus. Jehoram's rebellion deserves the same punishment and thus is comparable to Pharaoh's rebellion (2 Chr 21:14; 3.2.5). The primary emphasis of the allusion to Exod 2 in 2 Chr 22:11 appears to be the positive moral evaluation of Jehoshabeath (see 4.3.1.1 above), but, by implication, the Chronicler is further providing a negative evaluation of Athaliah. Given the stories' parallels, if Jehoshabeath is like Miriam and Pharaoh's daughter, and the child Joash is like the infant Moses, then Athaliah is like Pharaoh because she tried to kill all the (presumably male) heirs to the throne (3.2.6). In an allusion to the sin at Sinai, King Ahaz is compared to Aaron in Aaron's failure at the mountain; he led his people astray from his elevated position in the nation (2 Chr 28:19; 3.2.10). Despite being led by a godly leader (King Jotham), the people of Judah in 2 Chr 27:2 act corruptly like their forebears who rebelled against God at Sinai while Moses was on the mountain (3.2.9). King Hezekiah compares the people of Israel and Judah to their stubborn and sinful ancestors when he writes to them, asking them to return

to God and join him in Jerusalem for the Passover (2 Chr 30:6-9; 3.2.12). The final king of Judah is likened in 2 Chr 36:13 to the people of Israel when they were at Sinai and when they had inhabited the land and "stiffened their necks" against the God who brought them there (3.2.12).

The Chronicler also uses an allusion to Exodus five times to underscore a character's breaking of the Torah. King Asa (or if not him, then the people burying him) is shown to break the commands of Exod 30 by including a special ordination ointment in his burial (2 Chr 16:14; 3.2.2). King Uzziah presumes to take on a priestly role, and the Chronicler emphasizes his lawbreaking with two separate allusions to the Pentateuch in 2 Chr 26:16-21 (3.2.8). The Chronicler also uses allusions to Exod 30 and Num 17(16) to underline other assertions of lawbreaking. King Abijah states that Jeroboam and Israel forsake God and his law; King Hezekiah proclaims that his and Judah's ancestors broke the Torah with their failure to adhere to sacred duties (2 Chr 13:11 and 29:7, respectively; 3.2.8).

### 4.3.2 – Elevate the Temple and Priesthood

The Chronicler also uses allusions to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36 to elevate the status (or perhaps affirm/confirm the high status) of the temple and the priesthood (fourteen occurrences). These elevations can be primary (three occurrences), but they are typically secondary (eleven occurrences). The elevations happen through comparison to, or equation with, the tabernacle or by emphasizing the importance of the priesthood, as shown in the Torah.

The Chronicler elevates the status of the temple through allusions to Exodus seven times. Six times the elevation is the secondary focus of the allusion. The elevation of the temple is the primary focus only once (noted below). In 2 Chr 24:6-12, the Chronicler demonstrates with his allusion to Exod 30 that the temple is the valid successor of the tabernacle (3.2.7). As the tabernacle was to be supplied by a tax, so the temple should be as well. This same line of thinking applies to the allusions to Exod 30 in 1 Chr 29:7 and 2 Chr 34:8-14 (3.2.7). An added element in these two allusions is that care for the house of God is associated with consecration, service, and obedience to YHWH (see also 4.3.3 below). The Chronicler's allusion to the Pentateuch in King Uzziah's presumption to offer incense inside the temple explicitly elevates the temple (2 Chr 26:16-21; 3.2.8). The temple is a sacred space to be revered, and the king of Judah has not given it its due respect. Though it is not the primary purpose of the allusion in 2 Chr 29:7 (see 4.3.1.2 above), the temple's sacredness is emphasized when Hezekiah reviews how previous generations had forsaken the temple. Like those noted above from 3.2.7, the allusion in 2 Chr 29:31 to Exod 35 secondarily highlights how the temple is the successor to the tabernacle as the people of Judah bring offerings for the temple's repair (3.2.11). King Solomon's message in 2 Chr 2:2-3(3-4) also demonstrates that the temple is the valid successor to the tabernacle (3.2.8).

The status of the priesthood is elevated secondarily five times and primarily twice (noted below) through allusions to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36. The allusion in 1 Chr 9:30 establishes that the mixture of a certain ointment is the priests' prerogative only (see 4.3.3 below); this implicitly elevates the priesthood's status. The contextual discussion revolves around the Levites' responsibilities, yet the priests are singled out for working with this ointment (3.2.2). The allusion to the Pentateuch in 2 Chr 26:16-21 elevates both the temple and the priesthood; we just noted above that the temple space is to be revered. Along with that, the Chronicler explicitly asserts the importance of the priesthood as well. The king should not and cannot presume to take on their duties; those functions belong to the priests alone. The four recurrences of that allusion also secondarily elevate the priesthood as well (3.2.8). The Chronicler uses the allusion in 1 Chr 6:34(49) to establish a standard by which future events in his narrative will be judged (see 4.3.3 below), but implicit in that standard is an elevation of the priesthood. In a lengthy discussion of how David appointed the various roles and responsibilities for the coming temple to various members of the Levites, the narrator separates those roles reserved especially for the sons of Aaron. Specific duties at the temple are set apart for the priests. The second recurrence continues that theme in 2 Chr 2:2-3(3-4). King Solomon describes the temple about to be built in Jerusalem to a foreign ruler and includes the roles and duties expressly set apart for the priesthood. Though this is not the primary purpose of the allusion (see again 4.3.3 below), it implicitly elevates the position of the priesthood. Only priestly functions are mentioned in this description to foreign royalty. The third recurrence occurs in King Abijah's speech in 2 Chr 13:11. He measures adherence to God by the actions of priests. Jeroboam and Israel fall short because their priests are not legitimate; Abijah and Judah are faithful to God because the priests in Judah fulfill their special role. This emphasizes the importance of the role. The fourth recurrence is similar to the third in that Hezekiah evaluates previous generations by their adherence to the temple's regulations, performed by the priests. Again, the priesthood is the crucial benchmark by which a people's faithfulness is measured. Like the other allusions discussed in 3.2.8, the separate allusion in 2 Chr 26:19-20 to Exod 28 explicitly emphasizes the special position of the (high) priest. As much as the kingship may be an important place in Israelite society, the priesthood (and the high priesthood within that) are hallowed roles. Even the king must yield his preeminence when it comes to the priesthood's roles and importance.

### 4.3.3 – Establish and Reaffirm a Standard or Truth

In nine occurrences, the Chronicler alludes to statements in Exodus (and in three cases a co-evoked text in Numbers) to establish or reaffirm a standard or truth. If a standard, it is used to judge other elements of the narrative in Chronicles. If a truth, the allusion communicates to the reader the

reliability of what is stated. These standards and truths can be a primary focus of the allusion (six times) or a secondary focus (three times).

Establishing or reaffirming a standard for evaluating elements of the narrative occurs in six of the allusions. First Chronicles 9:30 alludes to Exod 30:25 and, with its primary focus, indicates that only priests may prepare a special ointment mixture reserved for use in consecration (3.2.2). The surrounding context of 1 Chr 9:30 indicates this preparation is for the house of God (in line with the context from Exod 30:25). When the same mixture is mentioned again (in 2 Chr 16:14) for burial use, the established standard in 1 Chr 9:30 indicates the burial usage is wrong. First Chronicles 29:7 alludes to Exod 30:11-16 and indicates explicitly that care for and provision of the temple is equated to consecration (even for non-priests) and obedience to YHWH (3.2.7). When characters later in the narrative care for the temple, the reader may recall this allusion and understand why the narrator looks favorably upon the later characters' actions. When the same allusion recurs in 2 Chr 34:8-14, it reaffirms as a primary purpose of the allusion how important it is for the king and the people to care for the temple (3.2.7). This allusion in 2 Chr 34:8-14 also functions as part of the build-up immediately prior to the plot apex before the steep decline in 2 Chr 36 (see 5.3.3 *Plot Movement* below). The degradation and fall of the temple in 2 Chr 36:14-19 are, in part, so impactful because the standard has just recently been reaffirmed. The final three examples that establish and reaffirm a standard occur in allusions to Exod 30:7-8 and Num 17:5(16:40) (3.2.8). The allusion in 1 Chr 6:34(49) explicitly establishes the standard for such priestly work in Chronicles. Any variation from this standard puts the atonement of Israel in question. When King Solomon describes the work of the temple in 2 Chr 2:2-3(3-4), he explicitly reaffirms the standard established earlier in the text. This is important because the actual building and use of the temple are much closer at that point in the narrative. It reminds the reader of what the expectation should be for the priests and the function of the temple. King Abijah recalls the allusion in 2 Chr 13:11 and uses the standard to evaluate Jeroboam's and Israel's priestly practices negatively. By asserting Judah's (and his own) faithfulness to proper priestly functions, Abijah also implicitly reaffirms the standard by which future generations will be judged. When King Hezekiah recalls the allusion later in 2 Chr 29, he negatively evaluates past generations because they did not meet the standard.

We observe the establishment and reaffirmation of a truth through allusion to Exodus three times in the study (twice as a secondary function and once as a primary function; the primary instance is noted below). King David alludes to Exod 9 in 1 Chr 21:17, understanding his disobedience and God's resultant judgment as comparable to the plagues against Pharaoh and Egypt (3.2.5). Though his response differentiates him from Pharaoh (see 4.3.1.1 above), the Chronicler establishes with David's allusion (as its primary function) that God does not withhold proper

punishment, even against a great king. Thus, when the same allusion is used again in 2 Chr 21:14 in Elijah's letter to King Jehoram, the reader knows that God will execute his judgment against Jehoram (3.2.5); indeed, the judgment comes immediately after the end of Elijah's letter. Just as God judged Pharaoh, and even King David, when the punishment was warranted, so he will judge Jehoram. While the primary purpose of the allusion is to evaluate Jehoram negatively (see 4.3.1.2 above), the reader is nonetheless assured that God will judge. The last case of establishing a truth with an allusion to Exodus (and its co-evoked text of Deut 9) occurs in 2 Chr 27:2 (3.2.9). King Jotham does what is right in God's sight, but his people do not. Just like with Moses at Sinai, God does not hold Jotham responsible for the corrupt behavior of his people. We see in this allusion an example of how the Chronicler affirms the concept of individual responsibility.[14] Though the negative evaluation of the people is the allusion's primary function (see 4.3.1.2 above), and there is certainly a corporate identity amongst God's people in Chronicles,[15] the Chronicler states with this allusion that the fate and evaluation of the king and his people need not be the same.

### 4.3.4 – Exegesis

In three occurrences in 2 Chr 10-36, the Chronicler alludes to Exodus (along with Deuteronomy in two instances) and provides exegesis for the connected passages in question. Twice, the Chronicler combines two pentateuchal texts to interpret them, and once he demonstrates an event of his narrative is the fulfillment of a promise from Exodus. These examples of exegesis can be a primary focus of the allusion (once) or a secondary focus (twice).

The first two examples occur in 2 Chr 19:10 and 2 Chr 35:13. In both cases, the exegetical use of the allusion is the secondary focus of the allusion. In 2 Chr 19:10, the Chronicler alludes as his primary focus to illustrate how King Jehoshaphat is like Moses in Jehoshaphat's creation of a judicial system (see 4.3.1.1 above). However, in his comparison of Jehoshaphat's and Moses' systems, the Chronicler combines and develops Moses' system as described in Exod 18:20 and Deut 17:8 (3.2.3).[16] "[T]he Chronicler does not simply duplicate and combine older legal material. He selects, supplements, and hence transforms earlier forensic theory and precedent" (Knoppers, 1994:77). The Chronicler takes the pentateuchal examples and brings them into the time of Jehoshaphat and into the Chronicler's own time when Israel had no king. The Chronicler presents an ideal justice system built upon two different pentateuchal texts (cf. 62, 79-80). The second

---

[14] Cf., e.g., Dillard (1986:76-81); Japhet (1993:44-45; 1997:163-164); Klein (2006:46-47); and Ben Zvi (2014:228-229).

[15] See, e.g., Williamson (1977); Evans (2013b:80); and Jonker (2016).

[16] This combination of texts occurs with two separate allusions (one to Exod 18:20 and the other to Deut 17:8) in the same verse, rather than one allusion to two texts simultaneously as in the following instance. Thus, we do not label Deut 17:8 as a "co-evoked" text with Exod 18:20. Cf. n. 1 above.

example in which the Chronicler combines two pentateuchal texts for exegetical purposes describes the Passover under the supervision of Josiah (2 Chr 35:13; 3.2.15). Like the first example, this allusion's primary purpose is to provide a positive evaluation of a king. We also recognize that the Chronicler combines two texts (Exod 12:9-11 and Deut 16:7) and explains how King Josiah has met in one act the requirements of both texts.

The final example of exegesis through allusion to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36 occurs in 2 Chr 32:21. The primary purpose of this allusion is to show how God's destruction of the Assyrian army fulfills his promise of deliverance in Exod 23:20, 23 (3.2.13).[17] Thus, the Chronicler presents an interpretative conclusion in his reading of a text from Exodus.

### 4.3.5 – Encouragement

The final type of usage of allusions to Exodus observed in the study is that of encouragement. Twice, the Chronicler provides hope and encouragement to the characters in the narrative and to the reader. Encouragement is the first allusion's primary function and the second allusion's secondary function. The allusion in 2 Chr 20 to Exod 14 encourages the fearful people as three armies approach (3.2.4). As God delivered his people from Egypt's mighty chariots, so he would deliver again. The second example is not as straightforward. The primary purpose of the allusion in King Hezekiah's message to Israel and Judah is to call the divided nations to repent from their sins and their ancestors' sins, return to YHWH, and come together for a Passover in Jerusalem (2 Chr 30:6-9). We see implicit in this allusion an encouragement about their shared identity. Though their ancestors were stubborn and sinful, they were together as one nation. In sending messengers to both Israel and Judah, and with Hezekiah reminding the people of their shared heritage ("Sons of Israel, return to YHWH, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel", בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל שׁוּבוּ אֶל־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם יִצְחָק וְיִשְׂרָאֵל, 2 Chr 30:6), the allusion to Exod 32 (and Neh 9) provides hope to divided nations that they may return and be reunited once again.

## 4.4 – Reciprocations

The Reciprocation step in our study looked at the allusions and their connected passages and posited how the alluding text(s) might influence a re-reading of the evoked text(s) (cf. 2.3.7). This is admittedly a subjective exercise with many potential outcomes, but it can provide additional insight into how one may understand the evoked text(s). We note three types of reciprocations in Chapter

[17] See 4.3.1.1 above regarding the implicit positive evaluation of Hezekiah and Isaiah in this allusion.

3: emphasis on longevity, that unfaithfulness may arise from within Israel, and positive and negative examples. We enumerate the various reciprocations in order of descending frequency.

The most-frequent occurring type of reciprocation considered in Chapter 3 contained an emphasis on longevity (eight instances), namely that what is observed in the book of Exodus can and will carry on into subsequent generations. These emphases on longevity concerned three topics: prescriptions of the Torah, positive actions, and negative actions. Four instances of reciprocation concerned the longevity of prescriptions of the Torah: (1) the judicial system practiced by Moses in Exod 18 (3.2.3); (2) the material provision for the worship space and its operation in Exod 30:11-16 (3.2.7); (3) the duties of Aaronic priests in Exod 30:7-8 (and Num 17:5[16:40]; 3.2.8); and (4) the regulations for the celebration of the Passover in Exod 12:9-11 (and Deut 16:7; 3.2.15). Two instances of reciprocation related to the longevity of positive actions: (1) care for the place of worship in Exod 35:5, 22 (3.2.11), and (2) good leadership despite the actions of the people in Exod 32:20 (and Deut 9:21) (3.2.14). Two instances of reciprocation related to the longevity of negative actions: (1) people acting poorly despite good leadership in Exod 32:7 (and Deut 9:12; 3.2.9); and (2) the lasting impact of sin upon a people in Exod 32:8-13 (and Neh 9:16-19, 26-32; 3.2.12).

The next most frequent type of reciprocation observed in Chapter 3 related to the possibility and future reality of unfaithfulness arising from within Israel itself (four instances). We considered this in the opposition to and disobedience of YHWH in Exod 1-11 (3.2.1) and, more specifically, in Exod 9:14 (3.2.5) and Exod 2:7 (3.2.6). We also considered this type of reciprocation in Exod 32:25 with the rebellion against God by a leader who should have known better (3.2.10).

The final type of reciprocation observed in Chapter 3 related to positive and negative examples of the issues discussed in the evoked texts (three occurrences). Second Chronicles 16:14 provides a negative example of the regulation in Exod 30:25 (3.2.2). The reaction by the people in 2 Chr 20 provides a positive example of how to respond in fear and illuminates the negative example of the people's reaction in Exod 14 (3.2.4). Second Chronicles 32:21 provides a positive example (or perhaps the exclusive example) of fulfillment to the divine promise in Exod 23:20-23 (3.2.13).

## 4.5 – Historical Implications

The Historical Implications step in our study considered what the examined allusions communicate about the evoked texts' standings when the alluding texts were written and what interpretive techniques were employed at the time (cf. 2.3.8). Like Reciprocations (4.4), this is also a subjective exercise with many potential outcomes, but it can provide insight for a diachronic understanding of each alluding text. We noted six types of historical implications from the various allusions in Chapter 3: (1) a high regard for pentateuchal and other HB/OT texts and their topics;

(2) the Chronicler applies texts to his audience; (3) the Chronicler's exegesis; (4) a willingness by the Chronicler to evaluate well-known persons negatively; (5) the Chronicler presents an ideal; and (6) the well-known status of certain stories. Though some of the above six types could apply to other allusions in this study,[18] we only survey below those examples specifically mentioned in Chapter 3. Thus, we may consider these examples of historical implications as representative. We enumerate the various historical implications in order of descending frequency.

The two most prevalent historical implications mentioned in Chapter 3 are (1) a high regard for pentateuchal and other HB/OT texts and their topics, and (2) the Chronicler applies texts to his audience. First, we saw not only high regard for the writing of Exodus and the Pentateuch (3.2.4 and 3.2.15) but high regard for the priestly commands (3.2.2), the Mosaic system of justice (3.2.3), the person of Elijah (3.2.5), the temple and its practices (3.2.8), and the events at Sinai (3.2.10 and 3.2.14). We also observed how the Chronicler applied his references to the Pentateuch to his audience in at least two ways: to challenge his audience to right action and to encourage them. The Chronicler either explicitly or implicitly challenges his audience to: not follow the poor example of Rehoboam (3.2.1), care for the temple and its practices (3.2.7, 3.2.8, and 3.2.11), follow Jotham's example and not that of his people (3.2.9), and follow the example of Moses and Josiah and not that of their people (3.2.14). The Chronicler also encourages his audience in the face of fear (3.2.4) and when forgiveness is offered to them (3.2.12). These applications of texts by the Chronicler reveal to the reader values that the author holds.

We also observed various items that, although they do not occur with as much frequency, are just as important for understanding the Chronicler, his time, and his audience. We noted examples of the Chronicler's exegesis in understanding when pentateuchal promises are fulfilled (3.2.13) and in the combination of pentateuchal texts to provide insight and clarity to the reader about the practices therein (3.2.15). The Chronicler is also willing to provide critique when he deems it necessary and does not hold back his negative evaluation of an important person, such as Solomon's own son, Rehoboam (3.2.1). The Chronicler is seen as hopeful in presenting his ideal for a justice system that builds upon the one prescribed and practiced by Moses (3.2.3). We also recognize that the Chronicler's audience must have known the story of Moses' origin well enough that the Chronicler could allude to it with subtlety and still communicate the intended impact (3.2.6).

[18] E.g., the negative moral evaluation of King Ahaz in 2 Chr 28:19 could certainly be considered an example of a willingness by the Chronicler to evaluate well-known persons negatively, or the handling of pentateuchal texts in 2 Chr 19:10 could certainly be considered an example of exegesis.

## 4.6 – Conclusion

This chapter reviewed the Chronicler's inner-biblical allusions to Exodus examined in Chapter 3 by summarizing and categorizing them according to the study's various methodological steps. We observed that the Chronicler uses an assortment of lexical, conceptual, and structural markers to indicate his allusions to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36. The Dating and Coherence steps consistently demonstrated that Exodus is the evoked text (along with its co-evoked texts) and that Chronicles is the alluding text. The Chronicler uses thirty allusions to Exodus (sixteen different allusions plus fourteen recurrences, for a total of thirty alluding texts examined) in 2 Chr 10-36. Each of these allusions had one or more of the following uses (in descending order of frequency): Moral Evaluation, Elevate the Temple and Priesthood, Establish and Reaffirm a Standard or Truth, Exegesis, and Encouragement. The Reciprocations observed were in one of three general categories: emphasis on longevity, that unfaithfulness may arise from within Israel, and positive and negative examples. The Historical Implications comprised six categories: a high regard for pentateuchal and other HB/OT texts and their topics, the Chronicler applies texts to his audience, the Chronicler's exegesis, a willingness by the Chronicler to evaluate well-known persons negatively, the Chronicler presents an ideal, and the well-known status of certain stories.

In the following chapter, we will investigate the text of 1-2 Chronicles using the narrative-analysis methodology outlined in 2.4 above. We will examine the setting, plot, characterization, and perspective of Chronicles to determine its rhetorical argument(s) and theme(s). We will then compare those results to the summative findings of Chapter 4 to discover how the Chronicler incorporates allusions to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36 into his rhetorical strategy.

# Chapter 5 – Narrative Analysis of 1-2 Chronicles

## 5.1 – Introduction

This study seeks to answer the following principal questions: Where, how, and for what purpose(s) does the Chronicler reference the book of Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36? How does the Chronicler's use of Exodus impact his rhetorical argument(s) in that part of the narrative? Chapter 2 addressed underlying methodological issues related to these principal questions. Chapter 3 addressed the first primary question above by identifying the Chronicler's allusions in 2 Chr 10-36 to the book of Exodus, assessing the nature of those allusions, and evaluating the rhetorical arguments motivating the allusions by using the methodological steps outlined in 2.3 above. Chapter 4 reviewed and summarized the inner-biblical allusions to Exodus examined in Chapter 3 and categorized them according to their patterns and themes, especially the allusions' uses. The present chapter addresses the second principal question above: How does the Chronicler's use of Exodus impact his rhetorical argument(s) in that part of the narrative? To answer this question, we examine the rhetorical argument(s) and theme(s) present in 1-2 Chronicles overall and in 2 Chr 10-36. We accomplish this by using the narrative-analysis methodology presented in 2.4 above to investigate the setting, plot, characterization, and perspective of 1-2 Chronicles. We then compare the results of this narrative analysis to the findings of Chapter 4 to see how the Chronicler incorporates allusions to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36 into his rhetorical strategy.

As we noted in Chapter 1, the text of 1-2 Chronicles can be broken up into three major literary units: 1 Chr 1-9, 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9, and 2 Chr 10-36. The following examines prominent themes and ideas of setting, plot, characterization, and perspective in each of the three literary units.[1] This allows for an easier comparison of the nature of the Chronicler's inner-biblical allusions to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36 with his overall rhetorical strategy in that section and throughout his work.

## 5.2 – Setting

The first component we consider for the narrative analysis of 1-2 Chronicles is the setting presented by the author. We focus in this chapter on the literary dynamics with which the Chronicler chose to communicate rather than the historical setting in which he wrote. We appreciate the importance of the historical setting in which a biblical text was written and the historical setting

[1] We do not look exhaustively at the details of setting, plot, characterization, and perspective in 1-2 Chronicles as a practical matter of limiting the scope of the study to a feasible length.

in which it was originally intended to be received (cf. Jonker, 2006:865). Indeed, if a narrator is trying to ground the narrative world presented in the text in the known world (as the Chronicler does with 1-2 Chronicles), then historical considerations are important (cf., e.g., Graham *et al*. [1997]; Kalimi [2005a; 2009]; Jonker [2013c]). We focus on the literary dynamics as a matter of limiting the scope of the study.

Settings are not universal throughout human experience.[2] Therefore, "…the reader must be relocated and reoriented by the narrative world. The sense of space must be derived, not from the cultural norms in the world of the receptor, but traced through the patterning within the narrative world of the text" (Lubeck, 2001:75). Understanding of a narrative's setting(s) "aid[s] the reader in understanding plot and identifying with the characters" (76). Thus, we examine it first.

### 5.2.1 – Setting in 1 Chr 1-9

Even a cursory reading of 1 Chr 1-9 reveals that these opening chapters of Chronicles are not a typical narrative in terms of setting, plot, characters, or perspective. Though the opening verses of 1 Chronicles begin with characters from the opening of Genesis and both 1 Chr 3 and 1 Chr 9 discuss Israelites after the exile, the intervening text moves back and forth through different familial lineages in different locations in different time ranges. There is no overt introduction of conflict(s) that pushes a protagonist and antagonist into sustained contention for some desired outcome. The text is replete with characters but does little to develop those characters. Instead, the first nine chapters of Chronicles consist of genealogical list after genealogical list interspersed with small vignettes (some only a verse or two). These vignettes reveal themes highlighted later in Chronicles (cf. Schweitzer, 2013:13).[3] These scenes are set off by the slower pace of the narration when the narrative arrives at these brief episodes. The slowed pace at these points supports Amit's general principle, "The more important the subject matter, the longer its time of narration" (2001:108).

The opening of Chronicles lacks any specific mention of a time or location. However, an awareness of the characters in the opening list reveals to the knowledgeable reader that this story starts at the *very* beginning (cf. Jonker, 2013a:29). Following the genealogical order in Gen 5 (cf. Japhet, 1993:56; Klein, 2006:61), the Chronicler begins his tale of Israelite history not with Jacob/Israel,[4] nor even with Abraham, but with the opening characters from the book of Genesis. If

---

[2] As an example, Lubeck observes that an approaching rainstorm does not connote the same to a desert-dweller as it would to an inhabitant of a tropical island (2001:75).

[3] See also Klein's study and comparison of parts of 1 Chr 2 and 1 Chr 10: "Another conclusion that emerges is that the two sections of Chronicles—the genealogical and the historiographical—are parallel to each other, presenting different perspectives of the same story; neither is introductory nor secondary" (2015:27).

[4] The Chronicler only uses the name "Jacob" (יַעֲקֹב) twice, in 1 Chr 16:13, 17, quoting from Ps 105 in both instances. See 5.4.1 below regarding the significance of the name "Israel" in Chronicles.

nothing else, this implicit setting tells the reader that this account will cover the whole scope of the HB/OT and places Israel's ancestors outside of the land of Israel. If the reader knows that the central literary unit of Chronicles focuses on King David and King Solomon, then this opening alerts the reader that the pace of the initial part of the story will be quick in order to progress the story from the opening characters of the HB/OT to David in only ten chapters (cf. Amit, 2001:106). We discuss the locative aspect of the setting first, then the temporal.

#### 5.2.1.1 – Locative Setting in 1 Chr 1-9

The grand nature of the opening, as well as the tale overall, is confirmed by the first two mentions of a locative setting. First Chronicles 1:10, 19 speak of אֶרֶץ ('earth/land') in the larger, global sense of the word.[5] Nimrod is the first mighty one (גִּבּוֹר) on the earth (1:10); in the days of Peleg, the earth was divided (1:19). These two mentions of אֶרֶץ in these brief interludes do not seem to connote anything specific regarding the setting other than the grand extent of the narrative.

The first mention of a specific location is in 1 Chr 1:43 with "the land of Edom". That this country is named here is understandable since Esau's descendants are named beginning in 1:35 (cf. Gen 36:1, 8, 9, 19, 43; cf. Klein, 2006:74). However, it is perhaps unexpected that a land with which Israel has had so much difficulty would be mentioned prior to Israel's own physical land in an epic tale of Israel's history. Edom's position then as the first specific setting mentioned in Chronicles perhaps provides foreshadowing that the land (and people) of Edom will play a role in the story (cf. 1 Chr 18:11-13; 2 Chr 8:17; 21:8-10; 25:19-20). The specific locations (regions and cities) mentioned in the remainder of 1 Chr 1 seem to provide a certain historical and literary credibility to the Chronicler's account (indicating that the author is staying close to his source of Gen 36) rather than a specific literary connotation for the narrative (cf. Lubeck, 2001:77-78; Amit, 2001:118-119).[6] The Chronicler uses locations to enhance his historical/literary credibility throughout 1 Chr 1-9.[7]

*Places of Worship*. The repeated references to Israel's places of worship with their various appellations in 1 Chr 1-9 highlight the significance of these locales here in 1 Chr 1-9 and for the remainder of Chronicles and show a connection between these structures.[8] The Chronicler typically

---

[5] The remaining ten uses of אֶרֶץ in 1 Chr 1-9 refer to a region of land rather than the global sense of the word: 1 Chr 1:43, 45; 2:22; 4:40; 5:9, 11, 23, 25; 6:40(55); 7:21.

[6] 1 Chr 1:43-48, 50, 54.

[7] E.g., 1 Chr 2:22; 4:21-22, 32-33; 5:8, 11; 7:28-29; 8:12.

[8] Additionally, Wright argues that the location of the fabula of Chronicles indicates that the temple in Jerusalem is of central importance to the narrative (1999:151-152).

uses either ‘house’ (בַּיִת) or ‘tent’ (אֹהֶל) in these titles. In 1 Chr 5:36(6:10), the temple is referred to as “the house that Solomon built in Jerusalem”.[9] The Davidic tabernacle is identified as “the house of YHWH” and the place where the ark of the covenant rests (1 Chr 6:16[31]). The title “the house of YHWH” appears in 1 Chr 6:17(32) and 9:23 as well. In 1 Chr 9:23, the house of YHWH is equated with “the house of the tent” (בֵּית־הָאֹהֶל). In 1 Chr 9:19, 21, the Davidic tabernacle is called “the tent” and “the tent of meeting”, respectively, connecting the Levites to their ancestral duties in the Pentateuch. In 1 Chr 6:17(32), the tabernacle is labeled as “the tabernacle of the tent of meeting” (מִשְׁכַּן אֹהֶל־מוֹעֵד), a title used elsewhere in the HB/OT only in Exod 39:32; 40:2, 6, 29.

Japhet notes that the shared title connects the times of Moses and David, and “the Chronicler anticipates the observance here of a full tabernacle cult” (1993:156). In 1 Chr 6:33(48), the Chronicler calls the Mosaic place of worship “the tabernacle of the house of God”, the only time the tabernacle is so identified in the HB/OT (cf. Klein, 2006:207). “The house of God” is used five times in 1 Chr 1-9 (6:33[48]; 9:11, 13, 26, 27) and extensively throughout Chronicles (cf. 207) of both the tabernacle and the temple, thus connecting the two different structures. In 1 Chr 6:34(49), the center of the place of worship is specifically noted as the “Most Holy Place” (קֹדֶשׁ הַקָּדָשִׁים).

This is the first occurrence of the concept of holiness in Chronicles; the pre-eminent place of holiness in Chronicles is at the heart of Israel’s place of worship. The whole complex is uniquely titled “the camp of YHWH” (מַחֲנֵה יְהוָה) in 1 Chr 9:19; this title is used only here in the HB/OT.

The overlapping of all these titles in 1 Chr 1-9 connects the Mosaic tabernacle with the Davidic tabernacle and the Solomonic temple and establishes the continuity between them. Sparks writes in his study of the genealogies in Chronicles:

> the Chronicler sought to combine all of the terminology he found in his sources into his text as synonyms for the temple of Yahweh in Jerusalem, even if these terms originally referred to different things. In so doing he seeks to illustrate a continuity in the worship of the people from the beginning of Israel’s history until his own day. He thereby indicates

[9] We note that the first mention of the temple in Chronicles is not about its grandeur or that it is the physical dwelling place of the God of Israel but only that Solomon built it. This points to Solomon’s characterization. See 5.4.1-5.4.3 below.

> that the wide variety of sources he possessed, although using varying terms, speak of the same reality… (2008:45).[10]

We note one last observation regarding 1 Chr 6:34(49).[11] In association with "the work of the Most Holy Place", it is significant that the author specifies where the work took place: on the two altars, the altar of burnt offering and the altar of incense. The author did not need to specify the altars; if he had wanted to discuss the act of making sacrifices, he could have done so without specifying such exact locations. An attentive reader would understand those activities happened at the place just named in the previous verse (מִשְׁכַּן בֵּית הָאֱלֹהִים, 'the tabernacle of the house of God'). That the Chronicler mentions the altars when there had been so little mention of the work of the priests before this point (only in 1 Chr 5:36[6:10], which is quite general) indicates a foreshadowed significance for these altars that is borne out later in the narrative.

*Hebron and Jerusalem*. Our final observations of locative setting in 1 Chr 1-9 relate to the cities of Hebron and Jerusalem. Both are discussed in positive terms, but the way they are compared indicates Jerusalem is the more important and significant city in 1 Chr 1-9.[12] 'Hebron' appears eight times in 1 Chr 1-9, but only four instances refer to the location (1 Chr 3:1, 4; 6:40[55], 42[57]).[13] The first two locative uses in 1 Chr 3:1, 4 are associated with the reign of David and thus are positive (see 5.4.2). The latter two uses are part of the *first* lot of land given to the sons of Levi (Kohathites, 1 Chr 6:39[54]); 1 Chr 6:42(57) specifically names Hebron as a city of refuge. We understand these as positive in tenor as well. Jerusalem is mentioned ten times in 1 Chr 1-9 (1 Chr 3:4, 5; 5:36[6:10], 41[6:15]; 6:17[32]; 8:28, 32; 9:3, 34, 38). The first two uses in 1 Chr 3:4, 5 are also associated with the reign of David and thus positive, as was the case with Hebron. First Chronicles 5:36(6:10) notes Jerusalem is the location of the house of YHWH that Solomon built; 1 Chr 6:17(32) has very similar verbiage to 5:36(6:10). These are positive associations because of the temple's important status in Chronicles. The reference to Jerusalem in 5:41(6:15) is negative

---

[10] Cf. Jeon (2018:4-6), who examines certain lexemes (משכן, אהל, and אהל מועד) used to refer to the Mosaic tabernacle, Davidic tabernacle, and Solomonic temple and observes that the Chronicler is not terminologically consistent in how he refers to each structure. In his conclusion, Jeon writes: "The Chronicler consistently mentions the Priestly sanctuary, i.e. the Mosaic Tent of Meeting, at every stage of the Davidic Ark-Temple cult's development; yet, by doing so, the authority and function of the Mosaic sanctuary is gradually replaced by the Davidic institutions" (14). With Sparks, we understand these varied usages as overlapping the terms' uses to communicate the structures' connection to each other. Sparks argues earlier that "[i]t is probable that the Chronicler believed that any location which housed the ark was 'the house of Yahweh'" (2008:44, here n. 38).

[11] We discuss the verse and its significance further below in 5.3.1 and 5.4.1.

[12] This aligns with the quantity of instances of the words throughout 1-2 Chronicles. "Hebron" is used eighteen times while "Jerusalem" is used 151 times.

[13] The other occurrences refer to a person (2:42, 43; 5:28[6:2], 6:3[18]).

because YHWH sent Judah and Jerusalem into exile. However, the importance of the tribe of Benjamin and the end of the exile create a positive association for the references to leaders from the tribe of Benjamin living in Jerusalem (8:28, 32; with repetitions in 9:34, 38) and post-exile inhabitants living in the city (9:3).[14] Hebron and Jerusalem are positive settings in 1 Chr 1-9, but the comparison of both the number of sons and the length of David's reign in each city implies Jerusalem is the more important of the two (1 Chr 3:1-9). David had six sons in Hebron and thirteen in Jerusalem. David reigned in Hebron for seven and a half years and in Jerusalem for thirty-three. The Chronicler highlights Jerusalem as the more significant city and prepares us for the importance of Jerusalem throughout his narrative.

#### 5.2.1.2 – Temporal Setting in 1 Chr 1-9

We examine first the Chronicler's pacing (both his compression and extension of narrated time) in 1 Chr 1-9, and second, his use of alterations of time, namely flashbacks, foreshadowing, and repetition. As noted above (5.2.1), the narration in 1 Chr 1-9 is fast-paced with occasional scenes and pauses. Lists of genealogies comprise the majority of the chapters. We discuss here the Chronicler's use of gapping and summary (and their underlying techniques of lists, standard phrases, and summary statements) to compress narrated time as well as the Chronicler's use of progress and freeze to extend narrated time and communicate his emphases.

*Gapping*. Though the people from the time of the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, and 1 Samuel (before Saul) appear in 1 Ch 1-9, the major events of those books do not appear in Chronicles (Japhet, 1979:206). Lubeck notes that an author leaves gaps in a narrative to entice the reader to become more engaged in the reading and perhaps even postulate reasons for the omissions (2001:83). Japhet moves from observing the large gaps in the Chronicler's opening to seeking potential reasons why. Rather than argue from silence and contemplate unprovable theories, she suggests the best route to understand why certain things have been omitted is to focus on what has been included (1979:206). We are left to conclude then that, in his history of Israel, the Chronicler focuses elsewhere than on its formative events; the Chronicler is concerned primarily with the setting of the Israelite monarchy (and then, specifically, the Judahite monarchy). This is not to say that the genealogies and vignettes in this opening section do not communicate the Chronicler's values and interests, but, in terms of temporal setting, the author appears interested in moving to the stories of David rather quickly.

---

[14] Kalimi notes that the Davidic dynasty's associations with Jerusalem in 1 Chr 1-9 from the time of David until after the exile indicate the importance of Jerusalem for the Chronicler (2002b:557, 561).

*Summary*. The Chronicler encapsulates large amounts of time into condensed statements in 1 Chr 1-9. He uses genealogical lists, standard phrases, and summary statements extensively. These lists, phrases, and statements summarize whole lives in a matter of a few words, or even in just a person's name. Some of the lists are names only (e.g., 1 Chr 1:1-4, 24-27), names prefaced with an explanation that the following names are someone's sons (e.g., 1 Chr 1:35-42; 2:1-2, 5-6; 5:27-29[6:1-3]; 7:34-36), and/or a comparable concluding statement looking back at the name(s) just listed (e.g., 1 Chr 1:33; 2:33; 4:6; 7:33; 8:38; 9:44). Some of the lists consist of "his son" (בְּנוֹ) appearing after each name (e.g., 1 Chr 3:10-14; 5:4-6a; 6:5-15[20-30]). The Chronicler also consistently uses the verb ילד ('to beget, father, bear') to move quickly through generations (e.g., 1 Chr 1:18-20; 2:10-13; 36-41; 5:30-40[6:4-14]; 8:33-34, 36-37). These techniques appear throughout 1 Chr 1-9 and uphold the quick pace throughout the narrative history being presented. When the narrator inserts vignettes or explanatory comments into these lists, or when he inserts genealogical digressions (Wright, 1999:149), we see how he slows down his pace to highlight emphases.

The Chronicler also uses summary statements regarding specific types of actions in 1 Chr 1-9 and not just summative statements that certain persons existed. Examples include reigning as king (3:4); sinning against God (5:25); serving the cult through music (6:31-32[46-47]); presiding over sacrifices (6:49[64]) or the administration of the temple complex (9:23-33); and fighting in battles, including forcing enemies to flee (4:41, 43; 5:10; 8:13). The telling of these events takes far shorter than the actual (typically iterative) actions themselves, thus providing the reader with information the author has deemed important while still maintaining a quick narrative pace.

*Progress*. "*Progress*" occurs when actions "take approximately the same time to perform and to narrate" (Lubeck, 2001:83; italics original). This technique for adjusting pace is used only once in 1 Chr 1-9, the brief vignette about Jabez in 1 Chr 4:9-10. The explanation of his naming by his mother and his prayer takes approximately the same amount of time to narrate as they would take in narrated time. This slows the pace enough for the reader to consider why it is that God grants the request of a person with an ignoble name (cf. Klein, 2006:132-133; Japhet, 1993:109-111; see 5.3.1 below).

*Freeze*. A "freeze" occurs when the narrator interrupts the action, slowing the pace of the narrative, to insert a piece of information, often something the author has deemed significant for understanding the present section or the narrative overall (Lubeck, 2001:84).[15] Freezes occur with

[15] E.g., a piece of background information about a person, place, or event, or a poetic reflection amid a flowing narrative.

regularity in 1 Chr 1-9. If the default pacing of these opening chapters is a genealogical list, then the typical freeze is an insertion of information about an aspect of setting or character. We observe multiple instances of this technique in the first chapter alone (1:10, 12, 19, 27, 43, 46, 50). Often, the inserted piece of data is more or less straight-forward information (e.g., the origin of a people group, 1:12; or the age of a man upon marrying, 2:21) or an explanatory grounds for a statement (e.g., the explanation for a name, 1:10; 4:14; 7:23; or the motivation for settling in a particular place, 4:41; 5:9). However, some freezes provide a moral evaluation (e.g., Er's wickedness, 2:3; the unfaithfulness of specific tribes, 5:25-26). Further still, certain freezes blur the line between explanatory and ethical, providing the reader with an explanation for how events unfolded but with language that speaks of moral evaluation (e.g., Reuben's status as firstborn, 5:1; certain tribes' success in battle, 5:20, 22).

Having looked at the pacing of 1 Chr 1-9, we now focus on how the Chronicler alters time in his opening narrative using flashbacks, foreshadowing, and repetition. Before we comment on these specific techniques, we note (as others have before; e.g., Wright, 1999:146) that the Chronicler has arranged a majority of the genealogies according to family lines rather than a purely chronological sequence that incorporates the families.[16] This inevitably creates a fluidity in the presentation of time in the Chronicler's opening since the reader proceeds down one family line to its end (or near its end) before jumping back to another family line that started many generations before.

*Flashback*. The flashbacks used by the Chronicler in 1 Chr 1-9 are brief snippets of information that color his current discussion rather than larger asides that tell a secondary story. These interruptions provide the reader with relevant information that did not appear previously in the narrative when it occurred according to the story's chronology (Lubeck, 2001:85). Because there are so few and so sparsely detailed narrative units within 1 Chr 1-9, flashbacks appearing in these chapters are likewise few and sparse in detail. These flashbacks inform the reader about certain characters' relationships with women (2:21; 3:9; 5:1-2), how or why certain people came to live where they did (4:40; 5:10; 6:39[54]), why certain people died (5:22; 7:21), or who was in charge (9:20).

*Foreshadowing*. Foreshadowing can indicate in both subtle and overt ways that something will happen later in the narrative, either suggesting its importance for later in the plot or focusing attention on how something will transpire rather than what will occur (Lubeck, 2001:85). Examples of foreshadowing in 1 Chr 1-9 include the origin of certain people groups (1:12; 2:53) and specific

[16] See, especially, the genealogies of the sons of Israel: Judah (2:3-3:24; 4:1-23), Simeon (4:24-43), Reuben (5:1-10), Gad (5:11-22), Manasseh (5:23-34; 7:14-19), Levi (5:27[6:1]-6:66[6:81]), Issachar (7:1-5), Benjamin (7:6-12; 8:1-40), Naphtali (7:13), Ephraim (7:20-29), and Asher (7:30-40).

time periods or events (e.g., when kings reigned in Israel, 1:43; David reigning, 4:31; the exile, 5:6, 22; Solomon building the temple, 5:36[6:10]; 6:17[32]).[17] The Chronicler also uses the phrase "in the days of + *name*" (בִּימֵי) to indicate significant characters later in the narrative (Hezekiah, 4:41; Saul, 5:10; Jotham and Jeroboam, 5:17; David, 7:2).

*Repetition*. There are certainly repeated words and phrases throughout Chronicles, but the repetition (as literary technique) that concerns us here is the repetition of episodes to emphasize the importance of the episode's themes and ideas. In the case of 1 Chr 1-9, we do not have repeated plot-driven episodes but rather the repetition of certain genealogies. The repetition of Shem and his sons in 1:24 indicates the reader is to pay special attention to what follows.[18] Indeed, this repetition leads to Abraham in 1:27. We see significant repetitions among the sons of Israel. Judah's line is discussed again in 1 Chr 4 after already being the subject of 1 Chr 2-3. The line of Levi is reviewed multiple times with multiple foci in 5:27(6:1)-6:66(81). The line of Benjamin receives attention in 7:6-12 and again more fully in 8:1-40. The descendants of Saul are highlighted a second time in 9:35-44 after already being listed in 8:29-40. These genealogical repetitions highlight the significance of these families.

Finally, we note Wright's observations regarding the macro-alteration of time by the Chronicler. The chronology of the events in 1-2 Chronicles is different from the presentation of those events (cf. 5.3.1). Cyrus's decree in 2 Chr 36:22-23 is not the final chronological moment of Chronicles; 1 Chr 3 and 1 Chr 9 include families after the exile (Wright, 1999:144). Wright observes that 1 Chr 3:10-24 "extends the Davidic line through Solomon well into the Second Temple period"; thus, the book's chronology opens with Adam and ends with the Davidic family after the exile (146; cf. 151).[19]

### 5.2.2 – Setting in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9

The locative and temporal settings in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 are more concentrated than in the first narrative unit. The locative setting moves from a broad scope (in 1 Chr 1-9) to a focus on just a few areas with even greater detail given to certain buildings within those areas (in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9). Various locales such as Gilboa, Gath, and Tyre receive mention, but most of the locative

---

[17] Lubeck cites Gen 10, the source for 1 Chr 1:12, as an example of foreshadowing (2001:85).

[18] The Chronicler focuses on Eber's son Joktan in 1:20-23. The author could have continued with a focus on Peleg and his sons after the summary statement in 1:23. Peleg, the presumed firstborn, and his descendants being discussed *after* Joktan and his family would perhaps cause the reader to pay special attention. By repeating the genealogy beginning with Noah's firstborn, the reader is forced to consider the reason for the repetition of so many generations.

[19] Wright identifies the "central genealogical-chronological sequence" as 1 Chr 1:1-4a, 24-27, 34; 2:1-16a; 3:1-24 (1999:146, 148-151, here 148).

attention stays in and around Jerusalem, with Gibeon to the north and Hebron to the south. In terms of time, the pace in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 moves much more slowly overall than in the opening chapters. The temporal setting centers on the lifespans of two men rather than a multitude of generations as in 1 Chr 1-9. However, like in the first unit, the narrative time in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 is not strictly linear. The Chronicler moves his story forward and backward in time and provides extensive pauses to the action as he focuses on specific aspects of his narrative.

### 5.2.2.1 – Locative Setting in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9

*Gibeon*. Though the word 'Gibeon' (גִּבְעוֹן) only appears five times in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 (1 Chr 14:16; 16:39; 21:29; 2 Chr 1:3, 13), it is an important location for the Chronicler. Gibeon marks an eastern boundary of the extent of the Philistines' defeat (1 Chr 14:16). However, the location is more attested as where the Mosaic tabernacle rested and the regular worship of YHWH continued after the ark was brought to Jerusalem. Each time Gibeon is mentioned as a worship site, it is identified as a 'high place' (בָּמָה; 1 Chr 16:39; 21:29; 2 Chr 1:3, 13). Gibeon is associated with the tabernacle of YHWH (1 Chr 16:39; 21:29) or tent of meeting (2 Chr 1:3, 13) and, in three instances, the altar of burnt offering (1 Chr 16:40; 21:29) or the bronze altar (2 Chr 1:5-6). This connection to the tabernacle and the altar reemphasizes their importance as originally established by the Chronicler in 1 Chr 6:33-34(48-49). Worship at Gibeon is associated with obedience to the Torah (1 Chr 16:40). This worship continues at Gibeon during David's reign and into Solomon's. This establishes cultic continuity from Moses to David and Solomon, solidifies Gibeon as Israelite despite its reputation from Josh 9 (Japhet, 1993:323; Klein, 2006:369), and demonstrates the legitimacy of Solomon's visit to Gibeon (Klein, 2006:369), one of his first acts as king in Chronicles.

*Altar(s)*. Related to the importance of Gibeon, the Chronicler highlights the importance of the altar of burnt offering, or the bronze altar, in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9. Just as it was associated with the place of worship in 1 Chr 6:34(49), the sacrifices performed at the altar connect it to both the Mosaic tabernacle (1 Chr 16:40; 2 Chr 1:5-6) and the temple (1 Chr 22:1; 2 Chr 4:1; 5:12; 6:12, 22; 7:7, 9; 8:12), thus further strengthening the connection between the two buildings. The association between the altar and the buildings facilitates a connection to the presence of God himself (Kislev, 2020:6, 8, 10-12, 16-17).[20]

[20] Japhet sees David's declaration in 1 Chr 22:1 as the climax and dénouement of the wicked census story from 1 Chr 21. God has chosen the location for the temple and altar. The grammar indicates the dual emphasis on both the temple and altar. She summarizes, "The house is God's, the altar is for the people" (1993:390). Jeon sees an allusion to

*Place of Worship*. The altar is inextricably linked to Israel's place of worship, whether it be the Mosaic tabernacle, the Davidic tabernacle erected for the temporary housing of the ark, or the temple itself.[21] These places of worship receive much attention in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 and evidence a change of authority from the Mosaic building to the Davidic to the Solomonic (Jeon, 2018:10-14; cf. Knoppers, 1995:467). The three buildings are called by many overlapping names, especially 'house'.[22] It is repeated throughout this literary unit that the house built by Solomon will be for the name of YHWH or so that the name of YHWH might be there.[23] YHWH has chosen it (2 Chr 7:12, 16; cf. Knoppers, 2015:143). The Chronicler highlights multiple of his narrative's themes in 1 Chr 22:19 when David exhorts the leaders of Israel to support Solomon:

> Now, set your heart and your life to seek (דרשׁ) YHWH your God. Arise and build the sanctuary of YHWH God to bring up the ark of the covenant of YHWH and the holy items of God to the house to be built for the name of YHWH.[24]

For Israel's leaders, seeking (דרשׁ) YHWH is associated with the building of the temple and its function. "The way to seek Yahweh is to build the temple and carry out its rites" (Klein, 2006:441). Japhet comments on the purpose clause in 22:19, "The statement of purpose also serves to emphasize that the primary role of the Temple will be as a permanent dwelling for the ark… it is one of the most basic concepts of the Chronicler regarding the Temple" (1993:403-404).

*Hebron and Jerusalem*. Hebron is significant at the beginning of this literary unit. David becomes king over "all Israel" in Hebron (1 Chr 11:1, 3), and David's army amasses in Hebron to assist in his becoming king (1 Chr 12:24, 39). However, the importance of Hebron transfers to Jerusalem as anticipated (cf. 1 Chr 3:4; 29:27; see 5.2.1.1 above).

---

Lev 9:24 in 1 Chr 21:26 and understands it as signifying a change of authority from the Mosaic altar to the one David has just built. Jeon then reads David's statement in 22:1 as confirmation of that change (2018:8).

[21] God himself says in 2 Chr 7:12 that he has chosen the temple as 'a house of sacrifice' (לְבֵית זָבַח).

[22] These names include 'the house' (especially 'of God' or 'of YHWH'; 1 Chr 17:4, 5, 6, 12, 14, 25; 22:1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 19; 23:4, 24, 28[x2], 32; 24:19; 25:6[x2]; 26:20, 22, 27; 28:2, 3, 6, 10, 12[x2], 13[x2], 20, 21; 29:2, 3[x3], 4, 7, 8, 16; 2 Chr 1:18; 2:3[4], 4[5], 5[6; x2], 8[9], 11[12]; 3:1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15; 4:11, 16, 19, 22, 5:1[x2], 7, 13[x2], 14; 6:2, 5, 7, 8, 9[x2], 10, 18, 20, 22, 24, 29, 32, 33, 34, 38; 7:1, 2[x2], 3, 5, 7, 11[x2], 12, 16, 20, 21[x2]; 8:1, 16[x2]; 9:4, 11); 'the tent' (especially 'of meeting' or 'of meeting of God'; 1 Chr 15:1; 16:1; 17:5; 23:32; 2 Chr 1:3, 4, 6, 13; 5:5); 'the holy place' (1 Chr 23:32; cf. 'the house of holiness' in 1 Chr 29:3); 'the sanctuary' (1 Chr 22:19; 28:10); 'the tabernacle' ('of YHWH'; 1 Chr 16:39; 17:5; 21:29; 23:36; 2 Chr 1:5); 'and the temple' (1 Chr 29:1, 19). By quantity of occurrences, the Chronicler seems to prefer the term 'house' for the temple built by Solomon. Perhaps this is related to the word play in 1 Chr 17 (and repeated in 2 Chr 6) about David's desire to build a house for God and God's promise to build the house of David. God refers to the building as 'house' on numerous occasions, so it is not a matter of human usage alone.

[23] 1 Chr 22:7, 8, 10, 19; 28:3; 29:16; 2 Chr 1:18; 2:3; 6:5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 20, 33, 34, 38; 7:16, 20.

[24] Each imperative and instance of 'your' is plural in the Hebrew.

Jerusalem is significant in both the life of David and Solomon and serves as the backdrop for the vast majority of this literary unit. David and "all Israel" go to Jerusalem and take Zion (1 Chr 11:4-5). David's family grows significantly in Jerusalem (1 Chr 14:3-4). David assembled in Jerusalem both "all Israel" to bring the ark to its resting place (1 Chr 15:3; cf. 2 Chr 1:4) and the leaders of Israel to transfer the kingdom to his son Solomon (1 Chr 28:1). The angel of YHWH threatening Jerusalem prompts David to repent in sackcloth for his sinful census and plead for his people (1 Chr 21:15-17).[25] Solomon returns to Jerusalem after encountering YHWH in Gibeon and amasses his military and wealth, reigning there for forty years (2 Chr 1:13-15; 8:6; 9:25, 27, 30). The most significant aspect of Jerusalem in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 is God's selection of the city as the place for the temple and the ark of the covenant (1 Chr 22:1; 2 Chr 3:1; 5:2; 6:6; cf. Jonker, 2015:423, 427). Thus, YHWH dwells in Jerusalem (1 Chr 23:25).

#### 5.2.2.2 – Temporal Setting in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9

The narrative pace of 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 is noticeably different from 1 Chr 1-9. The Chronicler does use similar temporal stylistic devices in this second literary unit as he does in the first, but the time span covered is significantly reduced. As noted above (5.2.2), the time covered in this second unit slows down considerably to focus on the lifespans of only two men rather than the large number of generations covered in the first unit. The gapping has consequently changed; narrative gaps in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 skip certain key events from the lives of David and Solomon rather than passing by large events for whole nations like in 1 Chr 1-9. Even the grammatical conjugation used in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 communicates a change in pace and style. As one example, the use of the fientive *wayyiqtol* increases sharply in 1 Chr 10 as opposed to preceding chapters.[26] We examine below the Chronicler's pacing and temporal stylistic devices in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9.

*Gapping*. Rather than opening his focused retelling of Israel's history (cf. 5.3.1 below) with stories from the first books of the HB/OT, the Chronicler's first in-depth story of this literary unit begins with a story from the eighth book of the HB/OT.[27] This literary unit begins at the end of King Saul's life in 1 Chr 10. First Chronicles 11 brings David back into the narrative (cf. the seven

---

[25] Jonker notes the Chronicler's use of this episode "claim[s] a special position for Jerusalem in contrast to the Benjamite sphere of influence" (2013b:93). Jerusalem, with its connection to the tribes of Benjamin and Levi, is protected from any connection to the sinful census (Japhet, 1993:378; Jonker, 2013b:89-90, 92-93).

[26] In the fourteen verses of 1 Chr 10, there are thirty-five *wayyiqtol*s, twenty-nine of which are fientive. There are only fifteen *wayyiqtol*s in the 124 verses of the three previous chapters combined; eleven of those fifteen *wayyiqtol*s are fientive. There are zero *wayyiqtol*s in 1 Chr 9. Fientive verbs are understood here as verbs that move the action along; summative verbs, stative verbs and verbs introducing or included in speech are not included. Many thanks to Dr. Michelle Knight of Trinity Evangelical Divinity School and James Bejon of Tyndale House for their personal exchanges that focused the observations here. It is outside of the methodology followed here, but a wider and deeper corpus-linguistic study of Chronicles could enhance the discussion of pacing and literary style.

[27] Here, again, we speak of the order of the HB/OT books as represented in *BHS*. See 1.3.2.

uses of 'David' in 1 Chr 1-9) at the time of his ascension to the Israelite throne. The earlier events of David's life (cf. 1 Sam 16 – 2 Sam 4) are skipped to focus on David's ascension. We also see from a comparison of 1 Chronicles and 2 Samuel that beginning in 1 Chr 20, the Chronicler refrains from retelling several negative episodes about David and instead focuses on David's (and his officials') conquests as well as David's preparation for the temple's construction.[28] This is not to say that David does not have faults in Chronicles (cf. David's failure to bring the ark to Jerusalem in 1 Chr 13 and David's sinful census in 1 Chr 21). Instead, keeping in mind Japhet's principle of understanding why items are omitted by focusing on what is included (1979:206; cf. 5.2.1.2), we can say that the Chronicler's gapping in David's life points to an emphasis on the preparation for the temple and that David leads that preparation. We see such gapping again in 1 Chr 23:1a ( וְדָוִיד זָקֵן וְשָׂבַע יָמִים; 'When David was old and full of days'), which seems to indicate a presumably large amount of time has transpired between 1 Chr 22 and 1 Chr 23.

The Chronicler also includes gaps in his telling of Solomon's life. Like the narrative of his father, 2 Chronicles omits multiple episodes from the 1 Kings source material about Solomon.[29] Instead, the Chronicler focuses most on the temple's construction and dedication under Solomon's leadership. The reader is not told how long Solomon's preparations for the temple's construction took, but 2 Chr 3:2 indicates construction began in the fourth year of his reign. Solomon's request for wisdom at Gibeon (2 Chr 1:1-13), military and commercial endeavors (2 Chr 1:14-17),[30] and temple preparations (2 Chr 1:18[2:1]- 2:17[18]) may or may not have taken the entirety of those three-plus years. If they did not, the Chronicler has sped forward to the construction of the temple, bypassing material from 1 Kings that focuses on Solomon. We see another large gap in the story of Solomon in 2 Chr 8:1. The narrator moves the reader to the twentieth year of Solomon's reign with no indication of the time it took to build the temple. As just noted, the construction began in Solomon's fourth year (2 Chr 3:2). The reader knows that the temple has been finished (2 Chr 5:1), the ark brought in (2 Chr 5:2-10), and the temple dedicated (2 Chr 6:1-7:9). However, no indication of the timing has been provided by the Chronicler. The length of the temple's construction is known to be seven years from 1 Kgs 6:38, ending in Solomon's eleventh year. This leaves some nine years unaccounted for by the narrator. The Chronicler desires to move from the temple's completion

[28] For a helpful comparison table, see Klein (2006:32-34).

[29] See Klein (2006:34-35).

[30] These verses are brought from a chronologically later time in the source material (1 Kgs 10:26-29). We discuss them further in 5.4.2 below.

(along with Solomon's own palace, which up to this point has received very little attention from the Chronicler) directly to Solomon's other building projects and conquests (8:2-6).

*Summary*. The Chronicler uses summative statements throughout 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 to either review the previous action and bring it to a conclusion (e.g., 1 Chr 10:6, 13; 18:13b; 29:26-30; 2 Chr 1:13; 5:1; 7:11; 8:16) or move the pace quickly on to the next topic or event (e.g., 1 Chr 10:8-12; 18:1-13a; 19:14-19; 20:1-8; 2 Chr 7:8-9; 8:2-6). Whereas in 1 Chr 1-9 the Chronicler used summative statements frequently to describe situations that took years to occur, these summative statements in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 more often describe events that took days or weeks to transpire (e.g., 1 Chr 10:9, 12; 12:23[22], 39-41[38-40]; 13:7-8; 2 Chr 1:18[2:1]-2:1[2]; 9:1-4).

*Progress*. The most common instances of Progress in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 occur at the start of or in the midst of dialogue between characters including prayers and blessings (e.g., 1 Chr 13:2-4; 17:1-14, 16-27; 19:2-3, 5, 12-13; 21:2-3; 22:7-19; 28:2-10; 2 Chr 1:7-12; 6:1-2, 4-42; 7:12-22; 9:5-8). There is one instance of actions taking approximately as long as it takes to read their description (when Saul and his armor-bearer kill themselves in 1 Chr 10:4-5). Generally, the action is not moved along in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 through Progress but Summary.

*Freeze*. The Chronicler sometimes halts the action in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 with extensive lists of military personnel (1 Chr 11:10-47; 12:1-16[15], 24-38[23-37]; 27:1-15),[31] Levites and their functions (1 Chr 15:4-10, 16-24; 16:4-6; 23:6-26:32),[32] leaders (1 Chr 27:16-28:1), and temple measurements and descriptions (2 Chr 3:3-4:22).[33] A unique freeze occurs in 1 Chr 16:8-36 when the Chronicler provides lyrics for a song of thanksgiving. A number of brief freezes occurs throughout 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 to provide explanatory comments (e.g., 1 Chr 10:4; 12:22-23[21-22]; 13:4; 15:22; 21:29-30; 2 Chr 1:3; 4:18; 5:14; 7:2, 9; 9:21).

*Flashback*. The Chronicler makes regular use of flashbacks in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 to provide the reader with more information. The most common use of flashback in this literary unit is to provide (additional) reasons for events that occur or why certain characters are noteworthy (e.g., 1 Chr 10:13-14; 11:2-3, 10-12:38[37]; 13:3; 15:13, 15; 16:15-22; 18:10; 19:2; 21:6, 29-30; 22:4-5;

---

[31] Occasionally there are events noted in the military lists, but they are flashbacks rather than story progression.

[32] When actions are noted in these lists, they are typically iterative (e.g., 1 Chr 26:27) or noted without reference to (a progression of) time and associated with the establishment of iterative duties (e.g., 1 Chr 24:5-18; 25:8-31; 26:13-16). Considering the length of text dedicated to these lists of names and functions, the Chronicler's emphasis is on the personnel and roles rather than the assigning actions.

[33] The summative building statements in 2 Chr 3:1-2 and 5:1 surround the Chronicler's lengthy description of the temple's construction in 3:3-4:22. Action verbs do appear in this passage, but the focus appears to be on the extensive list of temple components constructed in the building process rather than on the activity of building itself, especially since the Chronicler provides such a large quantity of descriptions for the components throughout the text. Therefore, we label this whole section as a freeze rather than some other temporal movement.

25:5; 2 Chr 1:4; 3:1; 5:11-13; 6:13; 9:10-11). Sometimes, the flashbacks are delivered by characters themselves rather than by the narrator (1 Chr 11:2; 13:3; 15:13; 16:15-22; 19:2). On occasion, flashbacks in this literary unit tell a secondary story in the midst of a story focused elsewhere (1 Chr 11:15-19; 12:16-19[15-18]; 2 Chr 9:10-11).

*Foreshadowing*. The Chronicler infrequently uses foreshadowing in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9. There appears to be foreshadowing in 1 Chr 16:35 with the adapted use of Ps 106:47. The cry "gather and deliver us from the nations" (וְקַבְּצֵנוּ וְהַצִּילֵנוּ מִן־הַגּוֹיִם) certainly fits a post-exilic Diaspora (Klein, 2006:367), but in terms of the narrative timeline of Chronicles, exile and Israel's deliverance from it are far off in the future. Solomon's construction of the bronze altar is anticipated in 1 Chr 18:8 as David amasses a bronze stockpile. First Chronicles 26:31 seems to look ahead to the end of David's reign (which is otherwise narrated in 1 Chr 29), but admittedly the chronological location of 1 Chr 26:20-32 is difficult to determine based on the Chronicler's telling. Some aspects of Solomon's prayer in both 6:24-25 and 6:36-39 foreshadow what is to come later in the final literary unit with various defeats at the hands of foreign leaders, culminating in the nation's exile.[34]

*Repetition*. The Chronicler uses repetition multiple times in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 to enhance and emphasize certain aspects of his narrative. God speaks to Gad in 1 Chr 21:10. Immediately following in 1 Chr 21:11-12, Gad repeats to David what God said in 21:10 and reveals more of what God said. Since the three options are not revealed in 21:10 but only at 21:12, this hesitation builds tension and makes the weight of the options feel heavier than if they had been presented two verses earlier. The Chronicler repeats in 1 Chr 27:23-24 aspects of David's census from 1 Chr 21:1-7. The repetition provides theological commentary on the census.[35] The Chronicler repeats the length of David's reign in Hebron and Jerusalem in 1 Chr 29:27. The reader was already informed of this in 1 Chr 3:4. This repetition provides a conclusion to David's life that transitions to David's death in 1 Chr 29:28.

Key among the repetitions focusing on David are those in 1 Chr 22 and 28 that reiterate the promises of the Davidic covenant in 1 Chr 17. David shares with Solomon in 22:10 what God spoke to David in 17:12-13. The rearranged order of elements in 22:10 indicates an emphasis on Solomon's sonship and elevates Solomon as David's equal (Klein, 2006:438). These promises are repeated in 1 Chr 28:6-7; David adds a conditional aspect to the promise. Other verses in 1 Chr 28 repeat verses from 1 Chr 22 (28:3 ~ 22:8; 28:7 ~ 22:10, 13; 28:10 ~ 22:13; 28:20 ~ 22:13). We

---

[34] The source for 2 Chr 6:26-27, 1 Kgs 8:35-36, foreshadows the events of 1 Kgs 17-18, but since those events are not retold in Chronicles, we cannot label 2 Chr 6:26-27 as foreshadowing within the Chronicler's narrative.

[35] See 5.4.2 below regarding the census and David's characterization.

observe an additional repetition in 29:1 of elements from both 22:5 and 28:20. These repetitions further confirm God's election of Solomon (despite Solomon's status as young and inexperienced) and link that election to the temple's construction (Klein, 2006:524; Japhet, 1993:488-489; Knoppers, 2015:154-156, 159).

The narrative focusing on Solomon also contains repetitions. Solomon is made king a second time by the people at 1 Chr 29:22, repeating what David did in 1 Chr 23:1. "The people's actions here confirm what was done in a preliminary way by David" (Klein, 2006:541). We also observe two instances of repetition related to the workforce of the temple's construction (2 Chr 2:17[18], repeating 2:1[2]) and temple equipment (2 Chr 4:16, repeating 4:11). The repetition of 2 Chr 5:13-14 in 2 Chr 7:1-2 enhances the Chronicler's storytelling. This repetition

> expresses the continuity of the two texts; the divine glory is a continuous state: it entered the Temple with the ark and still abides there, preventing the priests from entering to perform their service. From a literary point of view, we have the opportunity to witness here the process of resumptive repetition, intended to express simultaneity of events… (Japhet, 1993:610).

Part of the concluding information about Solomon in 2 Chr 9:27-28 repeats Solomon's accumulation of wealth and resources discussed earlier in Solomon's reign (2 Chr 1:15-16).[36]

### 5.2.3 – Setting in 2 Chr 10-36

The locative and temporal settings in 2 Chr 10-36 are more concentrated than in 1 Chr 1-9 but not as concentrated as in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9. The locative setting still stays mostly focused in and around Jerusalem, but the other locales mentioned are expanded. As one might expect, once the kingdom breaks and conflict increases between the northern and southern kingdoms of Israel and Judah, areas outside of Judah's (and Benjamin's) control are mentioned with greater frequency. The pace in 2 Chr 10-36 moves more quickly than in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 but more slowly than in 1 Chr 1-9. The temporal setting centers on the lifespans of the nineteen kings of Judah following Solomon. The Chronicler does use temporal stylistic devices such as foreshadowing, flashbacks, and freezes in 2 Chr 10-36 as he does elsewhere in Chronicles, but here in 2 Chr 10-36, they are typically not as frequent nor as lengthy when they do occur (except for foreshadowing).

#### 5.2.3.1 – Locative Setting in 2 Chr 10-36

*Jerusalem*. The city of Jerusalem again serves as the main backdrop for this concluding literary unit. Many events take place throughout the region at large, but Jerusalem is often noted

---

[36] See 5.4.2 below.

near or at the end of stories within this unit as the place of return and/or safety for the kings (2 Chr 10:18; 12:5; 19:1; 20:27; 33:13; 35:24). Jerusalem is also the place where the people gather, including the priests, Levites, army, and all-Israel (2 Chr 11:13; 15:10; 17:13; 20:27; 23:2; 26:15; 30:1, 5). These gatherings sometimes include great joy (2 Chr 20:27; 30:26). Jerusalem is also the place of judgment and justice (2 Chr 19:8). Jerusalem's most significant aspect in 2 Chr 10-36 is God's selection of the city as the place where he locates his name (2 Chr 12:13; 33:4, 7). Consequently, Jerusalem is the place where God's people come to seek him (2 Chr 20:4-5).

These positive qualities make negative comments about Jerusalem in the narrative even more striking. Jerusalem is twice noted as a place of harlotry and idolatry (2 Chr 21:11; 28:24) and gets ransacked because of idolatry (2 Chr 25:23). King Jehoahaz is deposed there (2 Chr 36:3). Then, in 2 Chr 36:19, the king of the Chaldeans destroys the wall of Jerusalem and burns the temple and the city. The place of safety, joy, and the name of YHWH has been ruined. The backdrop has been removed. Fortunately for his characters and audience, the Chronicler does not finish his narrative there. The author injects hope into this devastation when Cyrus says he has been appointed to build the temple in Jerusalem (2 Chr 36:23). There is hope yet for the city and its inhabitants.

*Altar(s)*. The altars at the temple in Jerusalem (for incense and burnt offerings) continue to serve an important role in 2 Chr 10-36 just as they did in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 (see 5.2.2.1 above). However, here in 2 Chr 10-36 altars also serve to reveal the character of the kings of Judah. This becomes apparent when one examines how certain kings interact with those temple altars and/or altars to other gods (e.g., מִזְבְּחוֹת הַנֵּכָר, 'foreign altars', 2 Chr 14:2[3]; or מִזְבְּחוֹת לַבְּעָלִים, 'altars to the Baals', 2 Chr 33:3-4). Kings Asa, Joash, Hezekiah, and Josiah all break down foreign altars (2 Chr 14:2[3]; 23:17; 30:14; 31:1; 34:4, 7), and Kings Asa, Hezekiah, and Josiah all have positive interactions with the altar of YHWH (2 Chr 15:8; 29:18-19, 21; 35:16). These kings are lauded by the Chronicler (2 Chr 14:2; 24:2; 29:2; 34:2).[37] King Hezekiah's disdain of foreign altars and regard for *the* altar (of YHWH) are well-known enough that enemies taunt him for them (2 Chr 32:12). Kings Uzziah and Ahaz receive judgment for their poor interactions with the altar of incense and altars to other gods, respectively (2 Chr 26:16, 19; 28:24-25). King Manasseh is a unique case because he both sets up foreign altars (2 Chr 33:3-5) and then takes them down (2 Chr 33:15). He even restores the altar of YHWH (2 Chr 33:16). The Chronicler portrays Manasseh as terribly

[37] Note that King Joash turns from YHWH after the death of Jehoiada the priest (2 Chr 24:18) as foreshadowed in 2 Chr 24:2 and receives judgment (2 Chr 24:24-25). It is interesting that of the four kings who remove foreign altars, the Chronicler does not write that Joash has a positive interaction with the altar of YHWH.

wicked (2 Chr 34:2) but also as repentant (2 Chr 34:13-19). “The Manasseh of Chronicles was a unique site of memory that embodied both grave sin and great repentance.” (Ben Zvi, 2013:136).

*Place of Worship*. The predominant term for the temple in 2 Chr 10-36 is “house of God” (בֵּית הָאֱלֹהִים) or “house of YHWH” (בֵּית יְהוָה).[38] The house of God/YHWH has many characteristics in 2 Chr 10-36, many of which are similar to its altars and to Jerusalem. The house of God/YHWH is the place for: sacred items (2 Chr 15:18), gathering to seek YHWH (20:4-5), music and joy (20:27-28), safety and hiding (2 Chr 22:12), covenant-making (2 Chr 23:3; 34:30-31), Torah reading (2 Chr 34:30), purity and holiness (2 Chr 23:19; 26:16-19), and the Passover (2 Chr 30:1, 15; 35:8). Like the altars, the house of God/YHWH reveals the character of the kings who engage with it. As one might expect, the Chronicler speaks kindly of kings when they treat the house of God/YHWH with respect (e.g., Asa, 2 Chr 15:8; Joash, 24:4; Hezekiah, 29:3, 15-17, 35; Manasseh, 33:15; Josiah, 34:8) and poorly of kings who desecrate it (e.g., Joash, 2 Chr 24:17-18; Uzziah, 26:16-21; Ahaz, 28:23-25; Manasseh, 33:4-7; Zedekiah, 36:14).

### 5.2.3.2 – Temporal Setting in 2 Chr 10-36

Like the locative setting in 2 Chr 10-36 is more expansive in comparison to 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9, so is the temporal setting of 2 Chr 10-36. The narrative here focuses on the reigns of nineteen kings and one queen, from the time of Solomon’s death to the exile. The Chronicler continues to use stylistic devices such as flashbacks and foreshadowing, though his use of repetitions decreases in this literary unit.

*Gapping*. Three times in 2 Chr 10-36 the Chronicler forgoes years of time to focus on events by which he may evaluate certain kings. In 2 Chr 15:19, the Chronicler moves the narrative forward some twenty years through a summative statement (cf. 2 Chr 15:10). The next series of events on which the Chronicler focuses is King Asa’s partnering with the king of Aram (2 Chr 16:1-10). The Chronicler has followed his source here (1 Kgs 15:17-22) but proceeds to add a negative evaluation of Asa from Hanani the seer. The Chronicler has tempered an overall positive evaluation of Asa with this unique message and poor response from Asa. The Chronicler similarly moves to the third

---

[38] ‘Temple’ (הֵיכָל) is used of the temple in Jerusalem only three times (2 Chr 26:16; 27:2; 29:16) while “house of God” is used sixteen times and “house of YHWH” appears sixty-one times. The temple is identified five times as “sanctuary” or “house of their sanctuary” (מִקְדָּשׁ [בֵּית מִקְדָּשָׁם]; 2 Chr 20:8; 26:18; 29:21; 30:8; 36:17). Appearing once each are: “House of YHWH God of their fathers” (בֵּית יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתֵיהֶם, 2 Chr 24:18); “house of YHWH God of your fathers” (בֵּית יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֹתֵיכֶם, 2 Chr 29:5); “house of YHWH his God” (בֵּית יְהוָה אֱלֹהָיו, 2 Chr 34:8); “dwelling place of YHWH” (מִשְׁכַּן יְהוָה; 2 Chr 29:6); and “his habitation” (מְעוֹנוֹ; 2 Chr 36:15).

year of Jehoshaphat's reign in 2 Chr 17:7 to discuss his sending out of officials and Levites to teach. Here, the Chronicler's gapping leads to an event that garners a positive result (2 Chr 17:10). The last example of gapping occurs in 2 Chr 18:2 with the phrase לְקֵץ שָׁנִים ('at the end of years'); the Chronicler gives the alliance with Ahab "an indefinite chronological location, whereas in 1 Kgs 22:1 it took place after a three-year peace" (Klein, 2012:261). Again, the Chronicler has more or less followed his source (1 Kgs 22:1-40) for the incident itself, but the alliance's negative assessment that the king receives from Hanani's son, Jehu, is unique to Chronicles (19:2).

*Summary*. The Chronicler's customary method for moving his narrative along is the summary statement. This occurs in 2 Chr 10-36 with even more frequency than in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 because the Chronicler moves through hundreds of years of Israelite history in twenty-seven chapters. The use of summary in 2 Chr 13 is representative of its use in 2 Chr 10-36. The chapter begins with summary statements placing the narrative within a certain temporal context and establishing familial connections (13:1-2). Relevant details that bring the reader to the point of focus are provided (military details in 13:3). The Chronicler moves to a speech or dialogue to provide a perspective or further establish the narrative conflict (13:4-12). The narration then alternates between summary and progress to bring the action to a conclusion (13:13-17), followed by an evaluative statement bringing some theological reflection on the events that transpired (13:18). Further summative statements are provided by the Chronicler before the king's reign ends with a regnal summary (13:19-22).

*Progress*. The Chronicler uses Progress in much the same way in 2 Chr 10-36 as he does in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9. Progress typically occurs in and around speech (e.g., 2 Chr 10:4-11; 11:2-4; 12:5-8; 13:4-12; 18:3-8, 12-13, 14-27; 20:5-19; 25:7-9, 15-16; 29:18-19; 32:10-15). There are a few instances when the narrative action slows down enough for the events to unfold in approximately the same amount of time as the narration itself (Athaliah's death at Joash's crowning, 2 Chr 23:11-14; Uzziah's attempt to burn incense in the Holy Place, 2 Chr 26:16-20; and Josiah's response to the finding of the book of the Torah, 2 Chr 34:14-21). These occurrences of Progress bring the events into the center of the reader's attention and bring clarity to the Chronicler's moral evaluation of the characters involved.

*Freeze*. The most common use of *Freeze* in 2 Chr 10-36 is to pause the narrative action to provide an explanatory comment, typically as part of a theological evaluation (e.g., 2 Chr 10:15; 11:14; 13:18; 14:5[6], 12[13]; 20:27; 21:6, 10; 22:4; 26:8; 28:19; 30:17; 32:29). Occasionally, the Chronicler provides short lists that pause the action and focus on the persons involved or the details offered (e.g., 2 Chr 17:7-8, 14-19; 24:26; 26:11-15; 29:18, 21-22, 32-33; 31:2-3, 12-16; 35:7-9).

*Flashback*. The Chronicler uses flashbacks in 2 Chr 10-36 to provide the reader with more information about why certain events have occurred (2 Chr 10:1, 2; 11:14; 15:9; 18:30; 21:3; 22:1; 23:14; 24:7). In this literary unit, the flashbacks occur less frequently than in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 and are very short (typically no longer than one verse). The longest flashback in this section, 2 Chr 28:17-19, provides both the military and theological reasons King Ahaz requested help from the king of Assyria (2 Chr 28:16).

*Foreshadowing*. The Chronicler uses foreshadowing more frequently in 2 Chr 10-36 than he does in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9. He uses foreshadowing to anticipate both positive and negative outcomes and, in so doing, creates a compelling narrative that rewards the observant reader and encourages the audience to participate in its telling and take ownership of its messages. The first instance of a positive foreshadowing occurs when the Chronicler assures the reader that the first part of Asa's reign will be positive by adding the phrase בְּיָמָיו שָׁקְטָה הָאָרֶץ עֶשֶׂר שָׁנִים ('In his days, the land was at rest ten years') to the royal transition statement (2 Chr 13:23[14:1]). In a similar way, the Chronicler assures the reader that the people will remain faithful for the remainder of Josiah's reign (2 Chr 34:33). When the king of Assyria *thinks* he can take the fortified cities of Judah in 2 Chr 32:1, the Chronicler is implying to the reader that the king of Assyria is going to be unsuccessful. In addition, we have observed in Chronicles that foreign forces are only successful if Israel and/or her kings have been unfaithful. At this point in the narrative, King Hezekiah has proven himself to be faithful to YHWH, so we can expect Assyria to lose. When YHWH sends an angel to defeat the Assyrian army in 32:21, the reader need not be surprised. There is a glimmer of hope in the Chronicler's foreshadowing in 2 Chr 36:20 when he writes עַד־מְלֹךְ מַלְכוּת פָּרָס ('until the reign of the kingdom of Persia'). The exile to Babylon and Judah's servitude to Babylon has limits. Indeed, the foreshadowing is confirmed just two verses later when YHWH stirs the spirit of King Cyrus of Persia.

The Chronicler uses foreshadowing to anticipate negative outcomes as well. The Chronicler lets the reader know in 2 Chr 10:19 that the narrative will not end with the northern and southern kingdoms reunited. Twice the Chronicler uses a comment near the beginning of a king's reign to foreshadow that kings will not be faithful to YHWH for all their reign (Joash, 2 Chr 24:2; Uzziah, 26:5). The prophet's warning to King Amaziah in 2 Chr 25:16 lets the reader know that Amaziah's life is not going to end well (2 Chr 25:27). By showing the reader the multiple ways in which Manasseh is disobedient (2 Chr 33:2-7) and then reminding the reader that God had conditioned Israel's possession of the land on obedience (2 Chr 33:8), the Chronicler has foreshadowed the removal of his people from the land (2 Chr 36:17-21). The Chronicler uses Huldah's prophecy to

communicate the same (2 Chr 34:23-25). In 2 Chr 35:21, Neco the king of Egypt declares to Josiah that Neco is operating at God's command. Without some sort of corroboration, the reader cannot know if this statement by a king of Egypt is true. The Chronicler provides that corroboration in 2 Chr 35:22, "And he [Josiah] did not listen to the words of Neco from the mouth of God" ( וְלֹא שָׁמַע אֶל־דִּבְרֵי נְכוֹ מִפִּי אֱלֹהִים) and foreshadows Josiah's downfall (2 Chr 35:23-24). The observant reader knows that when characters in Chronicles do not listen, things do not go well (2 Chr 10:15-16; 25:16, 20; cf. 3.2.1).

*Repetition*. There are no repetitions of whole scenes in 2 Chr 10-36, but we do observe two instances of repeated phrases that function in much the same way as repetitions in the earlier literary units. The first is Rehoboam's repetition of his young counselors' advice in 2 Chr 10:14. He does censor the suggested speech somewhat, but his repetition of the counselors' words emphasizes the lack of wisdom in following their advice rather than that of the elders (2 Chr 10:13). Second, the narrator's repetition in 2 Chr 33:7 of God putting his name in Jerusalem forever, so shortly after it was stated in 2 Chr 33:4, strengthens the contrast between what God intended for his house in Jerusalem and what Manasseh has inflicted against the city and the temple.

## 5.3 – Plot

The second component we consider for this narrative analysis of 1-2 Chronicles is the plot presented by the author. Amit illustrates in multiple ways the importance of a biblical narrative's opening and closing (2001:33-45), so we pay particular attention to the opening and closing of Chronicles.

### 5.3.1 – Plot in 1 Chr 1-9

*Plot Movement*. When one considers 1 Chr 1-9 as its own literary unit, there is no overt linear and sequential plot movement in terms of an opening, incitement, escalation, peak, resolution, and ending (cf. Lubeck, 2001:113-114).[39] As noted above in 5.2.1, these chapters move back and forth through different familial lineages in different locations in different time ranges. However, plot components in 1 Chr 1-9 can be extrapolated from the details presented to the reader in the various genealogies, and a chronological plot can be constructed. This constructed plot includes:

- the emergence of the nation of Israel in the context of universal humanity (1:1-2:1)

[39] Cf. Amit (2001:47), whose similar schema, the Pediment Structure, uses the terms: Exposition, Complication, Change, Unraveling, and Ending. First Chronicles 1-9 does not fit into any of the other biblical plot structure types highlighted by Amit: the Scenic Character (focusing on plot units and transitions), the Three-and-Four Structure, nor the Patterned Scene (49-68).

- Judah's pre-eminence among the sons of Israel after Reuben loses his birthright to Joseph (5:1-2)
- Moses commanding the cultic and sacrificial elements at Israel's place of worship with the sons of Aaron performing those duties (6:34[49])
- Saul's time as leader (5:10)
- David reigning (4:31), both in Hebron and Jerusalem (3:4), establishing musical protocols at Israel's place of worship after the transition of the ark there (6:16[31])
- Solomon building the temple in Jerusalem (5:36[6:10]; 6:17[32])
- separate kings over the nations of Israel and Judah (5:17)
- various kings leading Judah (4:41; 5:17)
- Israelites (including Judahites) being sent into exile because of their unfaithfulness to God (5:6, 26; 9:1)
- people from various tribes of Israel (not just Judah) returning to the land of Israel, even to Jerusalem, from exile (9:2-3)

Again, this constructed plot is not the order in which the Chronicler has presented his material. Rather, the biblical text has been organized in such a way that its arrangement highlights certain emphases (cf. Amit, 2001:46-47). However, the constructed plot above of 1 Chr 1-9 supports and further demonstrates Wright's contention that the opening chapters of Chronicles do not serve merely as an introduction to the so-called "narrative" portion of the book beginning in 1 Chr 10 but that the opening chapters tell a condensed form of the story that is then repeated and expanded in the remaining chapters, reviewing the narrative and slowing its pace down for further consideration by the reader (1999:154). Schweitzer cogently summarizes this position: "Wright's narratological reading presents the genealogies not only as being intimately connected with the narrative but as being the book in microcosm" (2013:14). This then presses us to reconsider the function of the genealogies and the location of the narrative opening in Chronicles (cf. Schweitzer, 2013:14; Sabo, 2013:47). If the "narrative" does not begin in 1 Chr 10 with the death of Saul, but in 1 Chr 1 with the beginning of humanity, then 1 Chr 1 with its setting(s), plot, characters, and perspective should be examined as the opening of the narrative. We acknowledge the form of 1 Chr 1-9 is different from 1 Chr 10 and beyond (see 5.2.2.2 above and 5.3.2 below), but we understand that the narrative opening of Chronicles' sixty-five chapters is located in 1 Chr 1 and not 1 Chr 10.

We now turn to the sequential plot of 1 Chr 1-9 as presented in the biblical text. Lubeck writes that "[n]arrative plots are teleologically driven: there is a projected ideal which the protagonist pursues. Obstacles and opponents interfere with the pursuit, but the protagonist continues in his resolve to seek the goal" (2001:111). Who then is the protagonist or protagonists of

Chronicles, specifically of 1 Chr 1-9? What is the goal? We discuss characterization below in 5.4, but for now, we submit that the initial protagonist of Chronicles is humanity itself, represented by the universal genealogy in 1 Chr 1, beginning with the introduction of the HB/OT's first human, Adam. The Chronicler opens with a fallen character (who had been given charge over the world; Koorevaar, 2015:232) whom the reader presumably knows has been driven out eastward (Gen 3:23-24), away from the place he was supposed to commune with his God, the God who made heaven and earth (Gen 1:1; 2:1, 4). The ending of Chronicles has the final speaker of the book, Cyrus the Persian King, the anointed of YHWH (Isa 45:1), announce that he works on behalf of the God of heaven who gives the kingdoms of the earth and offer any among the people of YHWH to return from their eastward exile to the place where they may be with their God (2 Chr 36:23). The book's ending is left open and unresolved but looks ahead with an invitation of hope (cf. Lubeck, 2001:128-129; Jonker, 2007b:715; 2012a:329-330).[40] The goal of the initial protagonist in Chronicles is to return to be with God. The book ends with that goal as a hopeful possibility despite all that has gone wrong in the preceding chapters.

A notable question in Chronicles is who will lead humanity in this quest and how? The plot in 1 Chr 1-9 seems to reinforce the search for answering this question. The primary action or event in the plot of 1 Chr 1-9 is the furthering of a genealogical line; in addition to the ways this action is intimated through name lists of various patterns (see 5.2.1.2 *Summary* above), the most frequently used verb in 1 Chr 1-9 (by a considerable margin) is ילד ('to beget, father, bear').[41] There are isolated vignettes within the genealogical lists (see 5.2.1 above), and they do contribute to the overall plot in these opening chapters of Chronicles. Yet, the key movement of the plot in 1 Chr 1-9 happens through the genealogies, so we examine their structure and themes first.[42]

---

[40] We further discuss the ending of Chronicles, as well as the plot type of 1-2 Chronicles, below in 5.3.3.

[41] Of the sixty-eight different verb lemmas present in 1 Chr 1-9, ילד is the most frequently occurring with 111 occurrences. The next most common verb is היה ('to be, to occur') with twenty-eight occurrences.

[42] Scholars have attempted to find a pattern in the arrangement of the Chronicler's genealogies, e.g., a chiasm (Sparks, 2008:29-32) or a pattern based fully on geography (Japhet, 1993:9-10). No one pattern/schema seems to explain fully the Chronicler's arrangement of the tribes in their genealogies. See, e.g., Jonker (2011b:369) regarding Sparks. Japhet's geographical explanation makes a concession regarding the first occurrence of Benjamin in the sequence; she then understands Asher's location amongst the central tribes as metaphorical since it would typically be among the northern tribes per Josh 19:24-31. We do not attempt to solve this issue but agree with Jonker (and Knoppers, 2004a): "No one would deny that the themes identified by S[parks] are central to the interpretation of Chronicles, and there will be consensus also that the Chronicler's genealogical section is a deliberately structured literary work. The influential commentary by Knoppers, for example, also indicates that there is an ordering of the different tribal lists so that Judah occupies the first position and is balanced by Benjamin in the last position, with Levi occupying the central position" (2011b:369). Cf. Hicks (2001:77); Klein (2006:192-193, 244); Jonker (2010b:300).

The structure of Chronicles' opening chapters provides an answer to who will lead humanity towards its restoration with its God. Israel's descendants emerge in 1 Chr 2:1-2 immediately after the universal genealogy in 1 Chr 1 (cf. Jonker, 2013a:29; Klein, 2006:80; Japhet, 1993:56). "The chapter implies the diversity *and* the unity of the world and it suggests that Israel understood its role within the family of nations and as a witness to all humanity" (Klein, 2006:81, emphasis original).[43] By placing Israel within the context of humanity at large, the Chronicler indicates that humanity's quest for resolution with its creator will come through Israel. Within Israel, Chronicles next focuses on Judah, even though Judah is in the fourth position in the list of Israel's sons (2:1).[44] After listing Judah down to Jesse (2:3-55),[45] the focus is placed on David and his lineage within the line of Judah, extending to beyond the exile (3:1-24). "Here, Judah is placed at the beginning, and within the tribe of Judah the house of David has pride of place" (Japhet, 1993:68; cf. Wright, 1999:151).

After David, the Chronicler revisits the family of Judah, emphasizing again his primary position amongst his brothers. Following Judah's repetition, the Chronicler again alters the order from his own list in 1 Chr 2:1-2 and lists Simeon next (4:24-43), perhaps with consideration of geographic proximity.[46] Next, the Chronicler moves to the tribes east of the Jordan, Reuben, Gad, and the half-tribe of Manasseh (5:1-26).[47]

The Chronicler places the tribe of Levi at the center of his genealogical structure, having discussed three-and-a-half tribes once and one tribe twice. The author focuses on multiple aspects of the tribe of Levi. He starts by tracing the leading priests through Levi's line (5:27-41[6:1-15]).[48] The next focus is on Levites in general (6:1-15[16-30]), beginning again with Levi and his sons much like the narrator did with Judah and his sons in 4:1. The Levitical singers receive the next focus (6:18-34[33-49]), prefaced by an introduction that discusses their duties at the appointment of David (6:16-17[31-32]). Of note here is the arrangement of the names in the list; the singers are listed with the most recent first, and each genealogical list traces backward in time to Levi (6:18-

---

[43] Klein "consider[s] 1 Chr 2:1–2 to be the continuation, indeed, the climax of chap. 1" (2006:59). He shortly thereafter acknowledges that 1 Chr 2:1-2 also functions as an introduction to 1 Chr 2-8. Japhet understands 1 Chr 2:1-2 to be the conclusion to 1 Chr 1 and the introduction to 1 Chr 2-9 (1993:65).

[44] Scholars note similarities between the list sequence in 1 Chr 2:1-2 and Gen 35:22b-26, though the lists do not match entirely. See, e.g., Klein (2006:80) and Japhet (1993:65).

[45] Within the line of Judah in 1 Chr 2, the Chronicler explains how "certain branches" of the family tree came to be "pruned out" while others produced "choice fruit" (Klein, 2015:20). This includes explaining why the firstborn of Judah does not continue the line ultimately to David (1 Chr 2:3).

[46] Simeon is in the south in the midst of Judah (Josh 19:1, 9).

[47] Much as he did in 1 Chr 2:3 with Judah's line, the Chronicler explains in 1 Chr 5:1-2 how it is that the firstborn sabotaged his own opportunity to become the focus of the subsequent lineage.

[48] Here we note Schweitzer's observation about so-called "high-priestly lists": "First, none of the 'high-priestly lists' in the Hebrew Bible are so designated. The high-priestly lists are always part of other larger complexes: genealogies or settlement lists. Thus, these lists are not explicitly about the high priests. If anything, the lists are about the tribe of Levi and its importance in Israel's history" (2003:389-390).

23[33-38], 24-28[39-43], 29-32[44-47]).[49] The transition between the Levitical singers and the Levitical priests is a general statement that other Levites "were given for all the service of the tabernacle of the house of God" (נְתוּנִים לְכָל־עֲבוֹדַת מִשְׁכַּן בֵּית הָאֱלֹהִים; 6:33[48]).[50] Aaron and his sons are then revisited specifically in their role as priests (6:35-38[50-53]), prefaced by an introduction that discusses their duties at the appointment of Moses (6:34[49]); this establishes a parallel to the singers. The Chronicler finishes his focus on the tribe of Levi by listing the various allocations of land to the priests and Levites (6:39-66[54-81]). Levi's importance to the Chronicler is confirmed by the length of text dedicated to them. Even the listing of the geographical allocations to Levi is longer still than the genealogical lists of any of the other tribes except for Judah and Benjamin. Additionally, the fact the Chronicler takes the time to list the various participants in the service of the place of worship indicates to the reader that the establishment of the place of worship will be of vital importance to the narrative later. This emphasis on the sons of Levi and the place of worship where they serve perhaps also provides the method of how the story's protagonist(s) may return to the presence of God. A son of David may lead the people (and thus humanity) in their return to the presence of God, but the return to God's presence will be mediated through the protocols established for the worship of and connection to YHWH.

The genealogies then return to listing other tribes (though Dan and Zebulun are absent). Issachar's list (7:1-5) would perhaps incline the reader to think the author is progressing to the northern tribes, but that expectation is quickly thwarted as Benjamin is mentioned next (7:6-12). Naphtali receives the briefest of discussions (7:13), then Manasseh (7:14-19), Ephraim (7:20-29), and Asher (7:30-40).

First Chronicles 8 details the tribe of Benjamin a second time but at greater length, emphasizing its importance and creating a connection with the twice-mentioned line of Judah (cf. Klein, 2006:244). Though Judah's line (specifically David's) still retains its primacy, this emphasis on Benjamin demonstrates certain equality with Judah (Giffone, 2016:7; Jonker, 2013b:86). Why does the Chronicler highlight the tribe of Benjamin? "The Chronicler gives Judah and Benjamin prominence because of their past loyalty to David and the temple and because they are the two main

[49] The list in 6:23[38] goes back one generation further to Israel.

[50] The significance of this general note is punctuated by this wholly unique epithet given to Israel's place of worship. See 5.2.1.1 above.

tribes that returned from the exile (Ezra 1:5). This chapter demonstrates that Benjamin has strong ties with Jerusalem and Judah (1 Chr 8:28, 32)" (Klein, 2006:244).[51]

First Chronicles 9:1 provides a conclusion to the tribal genealogies that began in 2:1 (Japhet, 1993:206; Klein, 2006:280; Hicks, 2001:112; Jonker, 2013a:74-75). Since the leader of God's people comes through the family of David, why would the Chronicler continue to list the tribes' genealogies once David's line had been enumerated? The Chronicler must make clear who Israel is if humanity is to be restored to God through Israel, and "Israel is to understand itself within the circle of all the nations, at whose center Israel stands" (Klein, 2006:80). This is especially true in the post-exilic context in which the Chronicler wrote (cf. Jonker, 2013a:75). First Chronicles 9:1 also puts into the clearest terms possible why Judah's exile happened: their unfaithfulness (בְּמַעֲלָם). This mention of exile anticipates the ending of the book in 2 Chr 36 and introduces the noun form of "one of the most crucial terms for the indictment made against Israel by the Chronicler" (Klein, 2006:265).[52]

The remainder of 1 Chr 9 tells of those who returned to the land (and Jerusalem) after the exile (9:1b-34) and then closes by repeating the family lineage of Saul (9:35-44). This final chapter of 1 Chr 1-9 raises at least two questions: (1) Why include the post-exile returnees following the genealogies of Israel's sons (1 Chr 9:1b-34)? (2) Why repeat the family lineage of Saul? Jonker and Klein provide an answer to the first question: "By including this information in the genealogical introduction the Chronicler created a sense of continuity between the Israel of the past and the post-exilic community in Yehud" (Jonker, 2012a:323). By discussing the post-exilic community, the Chronicler connects this community "to the legacy of all Israel" (Klein, 2006:81). Regarding the second question, the repetition of Saul's line at the end of 1 Chr 9 reorients the reader in preparation for the telling of Saul's death and the transition of the kingdom to David in the coming chapters (Japhet, 1993:202, 205-206; Klein, 2006:281; Jonker, 2010b:288). If the return to God will be led by a son of David and the presence of God will be mediated through the temple, then it makes sense that the Chronicler would explain the connection to David and the temple's mediation more fully in light of the post-exilic time period in which he finds himself writing. The Chronicler starting his expanded repetition just before David ascends to the throne befits such a literary endeavor.

---

[51] This connection to Jerusalem makes sense since Benjamin's inheritance included Jerusalem (Josh 18:28; cf. Judg 1:21 and Japhet, 1993:378; Jonker, 2010b:300; 2013b:84). Yet, also note the tension regarding Jerusalem's status observed by Kalimi (2002a:67) and later affirmed by Jonker (2013b:94).

[52] The verb and noun forms are used in tandem in 2 Chr 36:14 (לִמְעָוֹל־מַעַל) as part of the build-up to the exile. The verb מעל appears in 1 Chr 1-9 twice (2:7; 5:25).

*Opponents*. A story's plot is often driven forward by conflict. Typical to conflicts are opposed participants. By identifying the opponents in a story's conflict(s), the reader can further understand how the story's plot develops. In 1 Chr 1-9, we see examples of four of the five types of opponents listed by Lubeck (2001:115).[53] The most common type in 1 Chr 1-9 is "(An)other person(s)", typically another group of people. There are multiple mentions in 1 Chr 1-9 of people groups in conflict, typically because of a land dispute (1:46; 2:23; 4:41-43; 5:6, 10; 7:21; 8:7, 13).[54] We also observe a few examples of interpersonal opponents (5:1, 2; 8:8). There are also examples of conflict with others, but the opponent (or at least the source of the conflict) is identified as God (5:19-22, 26, 41[6:15]). There are multiple characters in 1 Chr 1-9 in conflict with God because of the characters' own wickedness (2:3; 5:25; 9:1). We see examples of a character in conflict with his society (Achar, the troubler of Israel; 2:7) and one character opposed by circumstances (Sheshan had no sons; 2:34).[55] Of special note are the opponents of the Transjordanian tribes in 1 Chr 5. A son of Reuben is carried into exile by his opponent, the king of Assyria (5:6). The Hagrites, another people group, are named as opponents to the tribe of Reuben (5:10). The Hagrites are listed again (along with others) as opponents to Reuben, Gad, and the half-tribe of Manasseh in 5:19, but 5:20, 22 make clear that the Israelite tribes' victory came about because they cried out to God. However, the narrative turns against the Transjordanian tribes in 5:25-26, when they are shown to be opponents of God because of their wickedness, and "the God of Israel" stirs up the king of Assyria to take them away. These verses set an early example in Chronicles of the same characters having God as both ally and opponent depending on their actions. The Chronicler displays the successful expansion of these tribes but balances this depiction by clearly explaining the reason for their exile (Amar, 2020:367). Thus, the unfaithfulness of characters in Chronicles overrules any physical prowess or success they may enjoy. Faithfulness to Yahweh is demonstrated as more important.

*Stock Forms*. The results of evaluating plot type and stock forms are similar to the results of evaluating genre in that they allow the reader to see the commonalities and the differences to a "larger tradition" or a prototypical example of specific categories of literature, thus enabling readers to have expectations that help them follow along in the text as well as recognize when the characteristics of the category of literature are being subverted (Hagan, 2019:199). We will evaluate the plot type of Chronicles later in 5.3.3. Regarding stock forms, 1 Chr 1-9 does not contain any lengthy examples, but we observe short examples of Vindication, Conquest, and Retribution.

---

[53] The five types are: God(s) or spirits, (An)other person(s), Society, Nature and circumstances, and Self.

[54] The inclusion of 1 Chr 8:7 here understands הֲגִלְּם to be the *Hiphil* form of the verb rather than a proper name. See Japhet (1993:190-192) and Klein (2006:248) for the relevant issues.

[55] In a text where the principal action is the furthering of a genealogical line, a character without the ability to further his own line may be understood as opposed by his circumstances.

We note at least one example of Vindication in 1 Chr 4:9-10.[56] The narrator first tells the reader of Jabez's honorable character. The next thing we learn about Jabez is the less than enviable name he was given because of the pain he caused his mother in childbirth (thus, through no fault of his own). God vindicates Jabez's honor by granting his prayer in 4:10; thus, the Chronicler communicates to the reader that names need not determine the character of people. Rather, individuals themselves determine their honor and actions, and God judges based upon deeds and the character that motivates them. Japhet writes, "Irrevocably burdened with a name which was determined by his mother's experience and is now to determine his own fate, Jabez takes the only possible step: a prayer to his God... The latent intrinsic force in the name is not denied, but is subordinated to the mightier power of God" (1993:110; cf. Balentine, 1997:261-262). Early in Chronicles, we see in this example of vindication that God (and therefore the Chronicler; see 5.5.1) is more concerned about an individual's character and conduct than what is determined by another, even a parent.

We observe a few examples of Conquest in 1 Chr 1-9. The examples in 4:39-43 and 5:10 highlight the taking of land to expand pastureland for livestock. There is a sense of finality to the passages and perhaps even an invocation of "holy war" with the use of חרם ('to put under a ban') in 4:41. The last example of Conquest in 5:18-22 fits the prototypical stock form of Conquest best because the conquerors rely upon God's strength to win rather than upon their own strength (cf. Lubeck, 2001:118). The Chronicler numbers the conquering forces in 5:18 but ultimately gives credit for the victory to God "because they trusted in him" (5:20).

Lastly, we see four examples of Retribution in 1 Chr 1-9. Their consequences include the loss of familial rights, death, and exile. Reuben loses his birthright as firstborn in 1 Chr 5:1 because he defiled his father's bed. Thieves in 1 Chr 7:21 are killed because they attempted to take others' livestock. Despite the territorial expansion discussed in preceding verses, the Transjordanian tribes are taken into exile by Assyria in 1 Chr 5:25-26 because they acted unfaithfully (מעל) and as a (spiritual) harlot (זנה) against the God of their fathers. Judah is also taken into exile in 1 Chr 9:1

[56] Perhaps another example can be found in 1 Chr 7. Sheerah is identified as a city-builder in 1 Chr 7:23-24 despite the naming of her relative Beriah (potentially connecting this story to the naming of Jabez in 1 Chr 4:9-10). The Hebrew syntax is not clear whether Beriah is Sheerah's father or brother (cf. Japhet, 1993:182; Klein, 2006:234). The name Beriah was given because disaster had come upon the house, but Sheerah changed that fate and instead is remembered as the only woman in the HB/OT credited with building cities. The Chronicler does not give her any other attributes, but we see another example from the Chronicler that naming does not have to define people nor their family. The Chronicler communicates value in what people do, not what they are called.

because of their unfaithfulness (מַעַל). The Chronicler communicates in these vignettes that justice comes to those who transgress set standards.

*Style*. The Chronicler extensively uses lists of various types in his opening nine chapters to tell his story. The interspersing of brief vignettes allows little room for further development of stylistic techniques such as suspense, irony, satire, or humor (Lubeck, 2001:120-122). As noted above, we do see brief uses of subversion of expectations (what Lubeck terms "parallels", 122-123) in Jabez's answered prayer despite his name (4:9-10) and Sheerah's city-building despite the name of her relative (7:23-24).

### 5.3.2 – Plot in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9

*Plot Movement*. The plot of 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 fits more readily into a standard plot movement than does 1 Chr 1-9 (cf. Lubeck, 2001:113-114). The plot of 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 may be understood through this rubric as follows:

- Opening: the transition from Saul to David; David is made king; armies gather to David (1 Chr 10-12)
- Incitement: the first attempt to move the ark of the covenant to Jerusalem fails; David strengthens his reign, including military victories; the means of ark movement is corrected; the second attempt to move the ark succeeds (1 Chr 13-16)
- Escalation: David wants to build the temple, but God has chosen David's son to do so; David further strengthens his reign, including military victories; David's sinful census incurs God's wrath against Israel; the temple site is selected; David prepares for the temple and its administration; David transfers the kingdom to Solomon (1 Chr 17-29)
- Peak: Solomon begins his reign and finishes the temple preparations; Solomon builds the temple (2 Chr 1-5)
- Resolution: Solomon dedicates the temple; God responds positively and issues a challenge to Solomon (2 Chr 6-7)
- Ending: Solomon's reign ends (2 Chr 8-9)

We concur with Balentine and others who observe that the Chronicler is "keenly concerned with the preparation and building of the temple", as many of the chapters focus on the temple (1997:260).

Much could be (and has been) said of the plot in this section, but we limit our comments here to a few general observations. First, praising God and praying to him are important features in this literary unit and are key factors in David's and Solomon's success (260, 263). Second, a tension that arises and continues within the Incitement and Escalation is the presence of two places of

worship. This tension is resolved with the building and acceptance of the temple in Jerusalem. "Given the Deuteronomic mandate for one central sanctuary, the existence of two national shrines can only be temporary. It is this situation that David's obedience and YHWH's dramatic intervention resolve" (Knoppers, 1995:465). Third, the text's emphasis on God's selection of Solomon (see 5.4.2 below) can be further seen through the smooth transition of power from David to Solomon. There is no struggle for the throne in Chronicles like there is in 2 Samuel and 1 Kings. Instead, Chronicles shows a transfer of power strongly supported by the nation's leaders (Knoppers, 2015:154).

*Opponents*. We observe three types of opponents in this literary unit: supernatural, other humans, and self. YHWH is an opponent to Saul because of Saul's wicked behavior (1 Chr 10:13-14), to Uzzah (and thus David) because the correct protocols for transporting the ark of the covenant were not followed (1 Chr 13:10-13; 15:2, 12-15), and to David (and thus Israel) because of the census initiated by David (1 Chr 21:7-14). In each case, a standard was not met, and God issued punishment. There is perhaps another supernatural opponent in 1 Chr 21:1, שָׂטָן ('Satan' or 'adversary') who incites (סות) David to initiate the census.[57]

There are multiple human opponents in this literary unit, both at a national and personal level. The Philistines appear throughout the narrative, along with the Moabites, Egyptians, Ammonites, and others. National opponents are successful when Israel's leaders act wickedly against God (1 Chr 10), but they are defeated when Israel and her leaders have God on their side (1 Chr 11:13-14; 14:8-17). At a personal level, we see Joab and David in opposition over the census (1 Chr 21:3-4, 6). The narrator informs the reader that David's wife, Michal, is an opponent to David because of her opinion of David's celebration (1 Chr 15:29).

There are a few instances of one's self (or group) being the opponent, indicated by the presence of sin. YHWH is the supernatural opponent of Saul and the one who caused Saul's death (1 Chr 10:14; note the *Hiphil* use of מות indicating causality), while the Philistines were the human agents who physically injured Saul, prompting Saul to fall on his own sword. However, 1 Chr 10:13 indicates that the reason for Saul's life ending as it did was because of his own sin. One thing separating Saul and David is their acknowledgment and ownership of their sins. David takes responsibility for the actions that ultimately resulted in the death of Uzzah in 1 Chr 13:9-10. David

[57] There is much debate about the identity of שָׂטָן. Some scholars see this opponent as Satan the supernatural being (see, e.g., Klein, 2006:418-419) while others understand this opponent as a human (presumably foreign) enemy of David and Israel (see, e.g., Japhet, 1993:373-375).

says in 1 Chr 15:13, "for we did not seek him according to the judgment" ( כִּי־לֹא דְרַשְׁנֻהוּ כַּמִּשְׁפָּט). Again in 1 Chr 21:8, 16-17, David acknowledges his sin twice and asks God to bring judgment against him and his family rather than the people of Israel.

*Stock Forms*. There are multiple stock forms present in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9. This literary unit begins with a story of Retribution. The Chronicler lists multiple sins by Saul in 1 Chr 10:13-14, so Saul is marked as unsympathetic and reaping in the prior verses what his transgressions sowed. Like in 1 Chr 1-9, this literary unit has multiple examples of Conquest. David and his forces are almost always the actors in these Conquests.[58] David and his forces engage in many battles, sometimes explicitly with the blessing of God (e.g., 1 Chr 11:14; 14:8-17; 18:6, 13). David initiates a Quest in 1 Chr 13 with his desire to move the ark of the covenant (cf. Lubeck, 2001:117). The Quest initially proves unsuccessful and falls short of the goal. The mistakes made in 1 Chr 13 are corrected in 1 Chr 15, and the Quest is completed. There is also an extended instance of Test. Solomon is not mentioned by name in 1 Chr 17:11-14, but YHWH informs David that one of his sons will be the temple builder. Then in 22:5-16, David specifically commissions Solomon to build the temple and explains the preparations that have been made. David commands the leaders of Israel to help in this endeavor (22:17-19). After enumerating the various personnel appointed for leadership among the temple complex and Israel in 1 Chr 23-27, David publicly commissions Solomon, and Solomon is made king. With his father gone and the kingdom his, how will Solomon respond? Solomon passes the test with high marks. He seeks (דרשׁ) YHWH or his altar (2 Chr 1:5) and asks for wisdom to rule (2 Chr 1:10).[59] Solomon then continues the preparations begun by his father and builds the temple and its furnishings. God demonstrates his approval of Solomon's request for wisdom (2 Chr 1:11-12) and of the temple building (2 Chr 7:1, 12-22). YHWH's appearance to Solomon in 2 Chr 7:12-22 also sets up the test repeated throughout 2 Chr 10-36: will Solomon's descendants, and ultimately the nation, seek and follow God or turn aside and serve other gods?

*Style*. We observe style choices by the Chronicler at key points that enhance the drama and/or tension in the narrative. There is a significant plot twist in 1 Chr 13 in the initial attempt to transport the ark of the covenant. The chapter begins positively with agreement amongst David, the leaders, and the assembly (1 Chr 13:1-4). They will move the ark to correct errors from their past (13:3).

---

[58] There is an instance of Solomon capturing a city in 2 Chr 8:3, but the event of the capture is not developed and receives only this passing mention by the Chronicler (cf. Klein, 2012:120-121).

[59] The referent for the third person masculine singular suffix on וַיִּדְרְשֵׁהוּ in 2 Chr 1:5 is unclear. The suffix could refer to YHWH, the tabernacle of YHWH, or the bronze altar at the tabernacle. Scholars tend to understand the referent as the bronze altar (e.g., Japhet, 1993:529; Klein, 2012:22-23) or YHWH himself (e.g., Hicks, 2001:261).

This is a good motivation. “David and all-Israel” join together to move the ark, and the Chronicler extends the descriptor for the ark, drawing out the narrative (13:6). The knowledgeable reader aware of the Torah’s regulations for the ark recognizes a problem with the mode of transport in v. 7, but the narrator does not comment directly on it; the unknowledgeable reader is unaware of any issue. The positive tone continues in v. 8 with celebration. All seems well. Verse 9 introduces an issue: the cart is jostled, and one of those driving it touches the ark to prevent it from falling. The anger of YHWH and the death of Uzzah in v. 10 come out of nowhere to the unknowing reader. Why was this man killed for saving the ark? Why is touching the ark forbidden? Why is David angry and afraid (13:11-12)? The ark is then left for a time, away from its goal (13:13-14). The story is left unresolved as the events of 1 Chr 14 unfold. Suspense builds as the story moves away from the ark and focuses on David and his exploits. The tension is not resolved until 1 Chr 15 when measures are put in place according to the Torah to ensure a successful movement of the ark.

We, the readers, also experience another form of plot twist and suspense regarding the building of the temple. David has been made king according to the word of YHWH (1 Chr 11:3), and YHWH is with him (1 Chr 11:9). He has the support of all of Israel (1 Chr 12:39[38]) and destroys foreign idols as instructed in the Torah (1 Chr 14:12; Deut 7:25). Even after making a terrible mistake in the ark’s transport, he corrects his error by adhering to the Torah. David seems the ideal king to build YHWH’s temple. Even Nathan the prophet approves (1 Chr 17:2). It is then a shock to the reader unfamiliar with Samuel/Kings that YHWH rebuffs David’s desire to build the temple. The reader of Chronicles knows Solomon is the temple builder (1 Chr 5:36[6:10]; 6:17[32]), so it should not surprise the reader that one of David’s sons will build the temple instead. The subsequent suspense is not built from not knowing who will build the temple but how and when it will happen. Solomon is not commissioned until 1 Chr 22, but then the narrator interjects many preparations by David before Solomon’s public commissioning in 1 Chr 28. Once Solomon takes the throne, there are still further preparations to make. The construction does not start until 2 Chr 3, and the ark is not brought into the finished temple until 2 Chr 5. The discussion of temple building begins in 1 Chr 17 but does not resolve until 2 Chr 5, more than fifteen chapters later.

### 5.3.3 – Plot in 2 Chr 10-36

*Plot Movement*. The narrative in 2 Chr 10-36 cycles through the reigns of twenty different monarchs over Judah and Jerusalem. The reader is already aware that Judah will ultimately prove unfaithful to YHWH (1 Chr 9:1), so a major question in the background throughout these reigns is not *if* the line of the kings will fail, but *how* or *when*. Many of the reigns narrated in this section could be assessed individually through the framework of plot movement, but the entire section may be evaluated with this rubric as follows:

- Opening: Solomon's son Rehoboam becomes king; early dissension in the kingdom (10:1-14)
- Incitement: The northern and southern kingdoms separate (10:15-19)
- Escalation: Litany of monarchs; some "good", some "bad", each flawed in some way (11:1-34:7)[60]
- Peak: The discovery of the Torah scroll in the temple leads to Huldah's prophecy to Josiah (34:8-21); Huldah confirms the (conditional) disaster threatened by God in 2 Chr 7:17-22 will come upon Judah (34:23-28)[61]
- Resolution: Babylon takes Judah into exile (36:17-21)
- Ending: King Cyrus of Persia offers hope of return (36:22-23)

We discuss the characterization of the kings of Judah below in 5.4.3. For now, we concur with Jonker's observation that the Chronicler's retelling of the lives of the kings "attempt[s] to explain to his audience that the Davidic royal line is not continued in the realm of politics, but rather in the sphere of cultic dedication to Yahweh" (2012b:371). A primary concern throughout 2 Chr 10-36 is the faithfulness to and obedience of YHWH, the God of the kings, the Levites (including the priesthood), and the people (cf. Jonker, 2017:395-397; 2020:466). For example, a king's military or economic prowess is not at the forefront of the Chronicler's evaluations of a king's leadership. Instead, the prayers of Asa (2 Chr 14:11) and Jehoshaphat (2 Chr 20:6-12) demonstrate that "in [the Chronicler's] presentation the victories turn not on military strategy or historical happenstance, but on a decisive act of piety: the king's prayer" (Balentine, 1997:256-257). In a similar vein, Wright observes that the "[b]attle accounts in 2 Chronicles… move the narrative both towards and away from a 'historical' norm of peace under a Davidic king, ruling in Jerusalem with the proper temple personnel practicing the proper rites, open to submissive northerners, all seeking faithfulness to Yahweh alone" (1997:174).

*Opponents*. We again observe three types of opponents in this literary unit: supernatural, other humans, and self. YHWH is both an opponent to his people when they abandon him (e.g., 2 Chr 12:1-5; 16:7-9; 19:1-2; 21:8-10, 16-17; 22:4-9; 24:20-25; 25:20; 26:16-20; 28:16-21; 33:2-11; 34:23-25; 36:12-21) and to the enemies of Judah when his people are faithful to him (e.g., 12:6-7; 13:16-18; 14:11-12; 20:1-22; 27:2-6; 32:1-22; 33:12-16; 34:26-28). We also observe an instance

---

[60] See Jonker regarding the Chronicler's subversion of expectations regarding the traditional portrayal of "good" and "bad" kings (2012b:344).

[61] Note the repeated phrase in 2 Chr 7:22; 34:24, 28; each instance uses the *Hiphil* of בוא ('to bring') with YHWH as the implied subject and רָעָה ('disaster') as the object. This phrase only appears in these three verses in Chronicles.

when YHWH opposes the enemies of Judah even when his people have been unfaithful to him (2 Chr 28:8-11). When his standards are met, he supports his people. When his people (and others) fall short of his standards, he is against them.

There are multiple human opponents in this literary unit, both at a national and personal level, just like in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9. Foreign forces from the last unit appear in this unit as well, such as the Philistines, Moabites, and Ammonites. We also see larger foreign forces in this unit such as Assyria and Babylon. The northern kingdom of Israel, following Jeroboam (2 Chr 10:2, 19; 11:14; 12:15), also arises as a foreign enemy, though they are from God's people (2 Chr 13:12, 15). As noted elsewhere (see 5.3.2, 5.4.2, and 5.4.3), national opponents are successful when Judah or her leaders act wickedly against God and are defeated when Judah or her leaders have God on their side. At a personal level, we see Athaliah rise to the throne by force, killing all those (save for one) who would have had a claim to the throne (2 Chr 22:1). We also see poor counselors who show themselves as opposed to the well-being of God's people in at least two episodes. They provide terrible advice and lead Rehoboam and Joash into significant conflict and judgment (2 Chr 10:8-19; 24:17-18).

There are several examples in 2 Chr 10-36 of a character being their own opponent. Each time a king chooses to follow bad advice (2 Chr 10:8-14; 24:17-18) or swells with pride (2 Chr 25:19; 26:16; 32:25), he becomes his own enemy. When a king rejects God and his law, he destines himself for failure (e.g., 2 Chr 12:1, 5; 21:10; 24:20, 24; 28:6). We also see clear examples of how kings' political marriages set them up to oppose God and thus become their own opponent (2 Chr 18:1-2, cf. Klein, 2012:261; 21:6).

*Plot Type*. The book of Chronicles does not fit cleanly into either standard designation of plot type. It is neither a tragedy nor a comedy. There are certainly elements of tragedy in Chronicles. God's people were not faithful to him, did not reunite with him, and did not enjoy his unmitigated presence with a righteous Davidic heir at their head. Yet, the Chronicler includes the post-exile generations in 1 Chr 1-9 and includes the decree of Cyrus (2 Chr 36:22-23), giving a slight uptick of hope at the end of his narrative. However, one cannot identify the story as a comedy either. The post-exile generation appears in 1 Chr 9, and the Chronicler indicates the people consist of members of Israel and Judah (1 Chr 9:2-3), but the Chronicler does not indicate the quality of their return nor the conditions in which they find themselves. The ending of Chronicles gives hope that a return to the land of promise and the (re-)building of the temple is set out by God, but the Chronicler does not narrate the people's return nor the temple rebuilding. The story is left without resolution; the reader is "unable to determine whether this unresolved ending points to accomplishment (comedic) or failure (tragic)" (Lubeck, 2001:128).

Jonker provides insight into the final verses of Chronicles and the narrative's connection to exile. The understanding of exile in Chronicles as a Sabbath rest (2 Chr 36:21) "render[s] the establishment of the Persian kingdom as a new beginning" (Jonker, 2007b:715). With its offering of hope from a Persian king, Chronicles "does not end in exile, but rather opens new perspectives on the post-exilic reality of Persian domination" (Jonker, 2012a:329). Jonker continues:

> The Chronicler is not primarily reflecting on the past in order to establish what went wrong so that Israel landed up in exile. He is rather reflecting on how Israel's past would situate the people in a new dispensation—a dispensation which became a reality because they were liberated from exilic bondage by the Persians (330).

How then do we understand the book's plot type? Adopting a term from Lubeck, we understand Chronicles as "proleptic comedy" (2001:128). He sees in critical junctures in the HB/OT a profound sense of anticipation through several repeated elements such as "(re)entry to the land", "a future prophet/king figure", and "a (re)new(ed) covenant" (128). Lubeck understands Chronicles as either the last book of the HB/OT or very near the end.[62] He offers this assessment of how the HB/OT closes:

> If readers understand these elements as indicative of a comedic outcome, they must nevertheless quickly amend and enlarge the concept to allow for what I would term 'proleptic comedy,' an ultimate 'and-they-*hope*-to-live-happily-ever-after' story that is yet to be realised. The ending of the Hebrew Scriptures remains a future, as-yet-unfulfilled promise: *someday* there will be a 'day of Yahweh' in which final vindication is achieved, and only then will the right people live happily ever after (128-129, emphasis original).

Chronicles is not comedic but looks ahead to when it will be. Chronicles ends its tragedy-filled narrative by engaging its present reality in Persia and looking ahead to a new hopeful future.

*Stock Forms*. The predominant stock form used in 2 Chr 10-36 is Retribution. Characters (or nations) commit one or more grievous sins and later receive punishment for their actions. We see many examples of this in Judah's royalty and opposing forces, but especially in Judah's royalty (e.g., Jehoram, 2 Chr 21:17-20; Ahaziah, 22:7-9; Joash, 24:18, 22-25; Amaziah, 25:20, 27; Uzziah, 26:16-23; Ahaz, 28:5-8, 17-19, 20-25; Assyria, 32:1-22; Manasseh, 33:2-11; Amon, 33:22-24; Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah 36:2-21).

---

[62] See Lubeck (2001:128, esp. n. 188).

Another stock form appearing in 2 Chr 10-36 is Conquest.[63] In a scene reminiscent of Jericho, God defeats Jeroboam and Israel when Abijah and Judah shout (2 Chr 13:1-22, esp. vv. 12-15; cf. Klein, 2012:204). King Asa cries out to God, and God defeats the Cushites (2 Chr 14:9-15). Jehoshaphat and the people seek God, and God delivers them (2 Chr 20:1-30). Hezekiah and Isaiah cry out to heaven, and God defeats the Assyrian army (2 Chr 32:1-22). This last example also shows elements of Vindication as Hezekiah and the people of Jerusalem endure taunting at the hands of Sennacherib's messengers prior to Hezekiah's and Isaiah's prayer (cf. Lubeck, 2001:120). Speaking of the accounts in 2 Chr 13; 14; and 20, Hagan writes, "In general, the Chronicler heightens the piety of Judah's good king through his prayer and speeches while minimizing the human involvement in order to celebrate God as the undisputable hero" (2019:207).

*Style*. The Chronicler employs irony and humor in 2 Chr 10-36 to enhance the drama and engage the reader. We provide five examples. First, the Chronicler enumerates a detailed list in 2 Chr 11:6-12 of the fortified cities Rehoboam built and the types of resources he stocked in each. After Rehoboam abandons the Torah of YHWH (cf. Jiang, 2019:449), Shishak of Egypt captures those fortified cities swiftly in one-half of one verse (2 Chr 12:4a). Second, the interplay between King Ahab of Israel and Micaiah is dripping with sarcasm. Ahab's response to Micaiah in 2 Chr 18:15 seems to imply that Micaiah gave some indication in 18:14 that Micaiah's response was not genuine, perhaps a flippant tone. Then, once Micaiah gives his truthful response in 18:16, Ahab's comment to Jehoshaphat is essentially, "I told you so" (cf. Klein, 2012:264). Third, in 2 Chr 18:2, King Ahab of Israel incites (סות) King Jehoshaphat of Judah to join Ahab in battle.[64] Though he is warned against it by Micaiah the prophet, Jehoshaphat joins his father-in-law in battle. In the battle, Jehoshaphat is pursued by chariots and appeals to YHWH for help. YHWH does indeed help; he incites (סות) the chariots away. Using the same word as Ahab's temptation/persuasion in 18:2 to describe how YHWH helps Jehoshaphat, the Chronicler reinforces that YHWH is to be trusted, not manipulative kings (Klein, 2012:267). Fourth, Hanani the seer confronts King Asa after Asa allied with a foreign king (2 Chr 16:7-9). Jehu, the son of Hanani, speaks words of warning to King Jehoshaphat, the son of Asa, after Jehoshaphat allied with the king of Israel (2 Chr 19:2). Since the son of Asa did not learn from his father's mistakes regarding alliances, the son of Hanani had to rebuke Jehoshaphat just as Jehu's father did with Jehoshaphat's father. Fortunately for Jehoshaphat, Jehoshaphat responded to the prophet's rebuke much better than his father did (2 Chr 19:4; cf. 2 Chr

---

[63] Hagan calls this stock form, "Battle Narrative" (2019:206).

[64] סות ('to incite, allure') is a relatively rare word in Chronicles and within the whole HB/OT. The Chronicler uses the verb five times (1 Chr 21:1; 2 Chr 18:2, 31; 32:11, 15). It appears in the HB/OT eighteen times total.

16:10). Fifth, after ignoring a prophet's warning from YHWH (2 Chr 25:15-16), King Amaziah instigates a fight with King Joash of Israel (2 Chr 25:17). King Joash's metaphorical response in 25:18-19 is full of biting sarcasm and condescension. Amaziah would not listen to God's prophet, nor his disrespectful enemy, as divine retribution for Amaziah's idolatry (2 Chr 25:20, 22).

## 5.4 – Characterization

Analyzing characterization is a crucial step in narrative analysis because "[t]he interrelationship between the characters, and between the plot and the characters, is vitally important to understanding the book as a whole" (Lubeck, 2001:155). The amount of characters present in 1-2 Chronicles is vast. A full character analysis is outside the scope of the present study, so we focus only on significant characters.[65]

### 5.4.1 – Characterization in 1 Chr 1-9

The narrator uses characterization in 1 Chr 1-9, but it is sparse. The narrator occasionally provides insight into characters through their actions and direct commentary. There is only one instance of direct speech in 1 Chr 1-9. The narrator frames his opening chapters in such a way that the reader, instead of the narrator, must supply most of the characterization. We discuss this aspect of Chronicles' characterization first.

*Humanity*. The first nine chapters of Chronicles are replete with characters listed in family genealogies. However, the majority of these characters have little said about them. Most have just a familial connection (e.g., son of someone else) and a name given; some have only a name. By presenting so little about the characters and moving on quickly, the narrator forces the audience to recall the characters as told elsewhere in Scripture, fill in the story for themselves, and then proceed to the next step in the genealogy. So it is throughout 1 Chr 1-9. The names have stories behind them that the narrator evokes with but a single word or phrase. Each name contributes to the plot and moves the story along, reminding the reader of the long history of Israel and God's work in that history (Hicks, 2001:67-68). Thus, the audience is forced to provide their own characterization. This is especially true in 1 Chr 1:1-27, where few digressions or narrator comments occur. The narration's pace moves rapidly from the outset. It consistently does not provide anything more than a name for these opening characters, thus seemingly blending them into one character, that of humanity itself.

---

[65] For excellent studies focusing on minor characters within Chronicles, see, e.g., Schweitzer (2003); Bodner (2013:36-41); Klein (2015); and Ristau (2015).

*Israel*. One of the most important characters in Chronicles is Israel (יִשְׂרָאֵל), both Israel the person, known elsewhere as Jacob the son of Isaac, and Israel the people group, the descendants of the person Israel, with its accompanying identity marker "all Israel" (כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל).[66] The name Israel appears seventeen times in 1 Chr 1-9, seven times referring to the person (1 Chr 1:34; 2:1; 5:1[x2], 3; 6:23[38]; 7:29) and ten times referring to the people (1 Chr 1:43; 2:7; 4:10; 5:17, 26; 6:34[49], 6:49[64]; 9:1[x2], 2). Throughout 1 Chr 1-9, the Chronicler only calls the person of Israel by his second name, Israel; never his original name, Jacob. Jonker explains that in helping the people to understand their identity as "all-Israel", the Chronicler "wanted to emphasize that the origin of this people goes back to the covenant bearer, whose name was changed from Jacob to Israel" (2013a:39). Aside from this consistent name usage, 1 Chr 1-9 does not provide much information about the person Israel. We know he is a son of Isaac, who was fathered by Abraham (1 Chr 1:34).[67] We also know that Israel had many sons (1 Chr 2:1-2; 5:3; 6:23[38]; 7:29), but his firstborn son Reuben defiled his bed (1 Chr 5:1-2; cf. Gen 35:22).

For the people group Israel, the Chronicler tells us they (1) have had kings (1 Chr 1:43; 9:1), and a king of theirs was distinguished from Judah's at some point (1 Chr 5:17); (2) have experienced trouble (1 Chr 2:7); (3) have a God (1 Chr 4:10; 5:26); (4) have at least in part experienced exile at the hand of a foreign power (at the initiation of their God, 1 Chr 5:26); (5) need atonement made for them (1 Chr 6:34[49]); (6) have record-keeping of family lines (1 Chr 9:1); and (7) some of their number returned to their property (1 Chr 9:2). Though we are not provided much information on the person Israel (thus making him a flat and static character thus far), we see many interesting data points about the people Israel, making for a round and dynamic character already. Each bit of information given to the reader is provided through the narrator's description or evaluation so that the reader can be confident of these characteristics.

*God*. As a literary character, God is very present in 1 Chr 1-9. He is referenced as אֱלֹהִים thirteen times and יהוה seven times.[68] Twice he is called אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל ("the God of Israel", 1 Chr 4:10; 5:26). These two verses show how God grants the prayers of the honorable and rejects those

---

[66] Klein notes the significance of "Israel" for Chronicles: "Israel in itself and in its relation to others is the subject of the entire work" (2006:74).

[67] See Jonker (2013a:38-39) on the significance of the use of ילד ('to beget, father, bear') in 1 Chr 1:34.

[68] אֱלֹהִים occurs in 1 Chr 4:10(x2); 5:20, 22, 25(x2), 26; 6:33(48), 34(49); 9:11, 13, 26, 27 in reference to Israel's God. The word also occurs a third time in 5:25 but refers to the gods of other nations. יהוה occurs in 1 Chr 2:3; 5:41(6:15); 6:16(31), 17(32); 9:19, 20, 23.

who are unfaithful to Him (cf. Balentine, 1997:261). God is also called "God of their fathers" once (בֵּאלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתֵיהֶם, 1 Chr 5:25) in the context of later generations of his people breaking faith with him. These three examples highlight his relationship with his people. Other examples show that God responds in favor of those who trust him and cry out to him, even destroying others (1 Chr 5:20, 22, 25). The name of God is associated with the place of his worship multiple times in the context of the administration of that place (1 Chr 6:33[48]; 9:11, 13, 26, 27). God is also associated with Moses, his servant (1 Chr 6:34[49]).

Concerning YHWH, the first two uses of this name indicate that he is an arbiter of justice (1 Chr 2:3; 5:41[6:15]).[69] Four times the name YHWH is associated with the place where he is worshipped (1 Chr 6:16[31], 17[32]; 9:19, 23) in the context of that place's protocols. In 1 Chr 9:20, YHWH is noted as being with Phinehas, an extremely positive statement for Phinehas (cf. 1 Sam 18:12; 2 Kgs 18:7) and an indication of the positive side of YHWH's arbitration of justice. Hicks highlights the significance for the post-exilic audience: "Just as the LORD was with Phinehas…, so he is with the gatekeepers in the Chronicler's day" (2001:116). This and the reference to YHWH in 1 Chr 9:19 indicate the seriousness of the task of protecting the place of YHWH's worship (116). Interaction with YHWH is not to be taken lightly.

These varied uses of אֱלֹהִים and יהוה in 1 Chr 1-9 indicate that this character in Chronicles will be concerned with standards, both standards regarding people's actions and standards regarding his worship (especially related to his place of worship). People who meet those standards will receive his blessing, and those who do not will receive his judgment.

*David*. David is mentioned seven times in 1 Chr 1-9 (1 Chr 2:15; 3:1, 9; 4:31; 6:16[31]; 7:2; 9:22). David is listed in 1 Chr 2:15 as the seventh son of Jesse, but 1 Sam 16:10-11; 17:12 indicate that David was Jesse's eighth son. "That the Chronicler made him the seventh son is telling, since the seventh position in lineages is often reserved for persons of significance" (Jonker, 2013a:46). David has nineteen sons listed in 1 Chr 3:1-8, in addition to however many sons he has from his concubines (1 Chr 3:9). The HB/OT places a high value on sons, so David is certainly a blessed man in this regard. In the process of listing David's sons, the Chronicler lists seven wives for David.[70] The number seven is special in the HB/OT, but Deut 17:17 indicates Israel's kings should

---

[69] The text of 5:41(6:15) does not specify the reason YHWH sends Judah and Jerusalem into exile, but 9:1 indicates that Judah was taken into exile because of their unfaithfulness.

[70] Michal, David's first wife (1 Sam 18:27), is not mentioned in 1 Chr 3, presumably because she did not have any children (2 Sam 6:23), and the focus of the list in 1 Chr 3:1-9 is on the children of David. The Chronicler is aware of Michal as she is mentioned later in 1 Chr 15:29.

not have many wives, so the number of David's wives may be a positive (with regard to the number seven) or negative attribute (with regard to Deut 17:17) of the king. In both 1 Chr 4:31 and 7:2, David and his reign are the temporal referents for other information, implicitly reinforcing his significance to Israel's history. First Chronicles 6:16(31) and 9:22 highlight David as the initiator (along with Samuel in 1 Chr 9:22) of key components of the function and security of Israel's place of worship of YHWH (cf. Van Den Eynde, 2001:426). If David is responsible for the administration of a setting so important to the Chronicler (see 5.2.1.2), then he is a key figure indeed. We can see in 1 Chr 1-9 that David is an important figure who will figure significantly into the plot of the book. However, besides his importance, the reader only knows that he has a large family and focuses his energy on setting up for the temple. This makes him a flat character thus far (cf. Amit, 2001:85). The reader may feel certain about the information about David because it comes directly from the narrator.

*Solomon*. Solomon is a key character later in Chronicles, but in the book's opening chapters, the Chronicler tells us little about him. First, Solomon is a son of David and Bath-shua, the daughter of Ammiel (1 Chr 3:5).[71] Second, Solomon is responsible for the building of the temple of YHWH (1 Chr 5:36[6:10], 6:17[32]). Each time Solomon is mentioned, Jerusalem is mentioned as well. Solomon is connected to the city.

*Levites*. Levi (לֵוִי), the son of Jacob/Israel, is mentioned six times in 1 Chr 1-9 (1 Chr 2:1; 5:27[6:1]; 6:1[16], 23[38], 28[43], 32[47]). The other ten times לֵוִי is used in 1 Chr 1-9 refer to the collective group of the Levites (1 Chr 6:4[19], 33[48], 6:49[64], 9:2, 14, 18, 26, 31, 33, 34). The Levites are flat and static characters but vastly important to the narrative. Some of the Levites are assigned to lead the music at the Israelite place of worship and do so according to their appointed regulations (1 Chr 6:16-17[31-32]). Another segment of the Levites is assigned to administer the various services of the place of worship (1 Chr 6:33[48]). A more specific section of the Levitical family line (the sons of Aaron) is assigned to manage and perform the sacrifices to YHWH and do so according to the command of Moses. The Levites are given immense responsibilities before YHWH and their fellow Israelites and do their work faithfully. The Levites are also reported to receive their cities and lands from their fellow Israelites. In 1 Chr 9, the Levites return to Jerusalem after the exile and resume their responsibilities (1 Chr 9:2, 14, 34; gatekeeping, 9:18, 26; cooking,

[71] Bath-Shua is known as Bathsheba the daughter of Eliam in 2 Sam 11:3 (cf. 2 Sam 12:24). Regarding the difference in her name and the name of her father, as well as the order of David's sons in 2 Chr 3:5, see Klein (2006:115-116). Kalimi argues that the fourth position of Solomon in this list is meant to emphasize Solomon's importance (2002b:557). It may very well do that, but Klein observes that the order in 2 Chr 3:5 is the same as the order in 2 Sam 5:14 (2006:15).

9:31; music, 9:33). Intimately connected to Jerusalem and the temple, two important settings with the narrative, the Levites are shown to be trustworthy and worthy of honor.

*Foreign Forces*. In these opening chapters of Chronicles, foreign forces are established as flat characters operating at God's command rather than their own initiative. Their military successes or failures are dictated by God rather than their own strength. Examples include the Hagrites and their allies (1 Chr 5:19-20), Assyria (1 Chr 5:26; cf. 5:6), and Babylon (1 Chr 5:41[6:15]).

### 5.4.2 – Characterization in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9

*Saul*. As noted above in 5.3.2, the opening main character in 1 Chr 10 is an unsympathetic character who receives his due retribution (1 Chr 10:13-14). The Chronicler focuses on Saul, the person, rather than the institution of kingship, as does the author of Samuel. "[W]ith this strategy the Chronicler does not implicate the tribe of Benjamin, but rather the individual king" (Jonker, 2010b:293). Saul is a flat, static character implicated by the Chronicler with the author's use of מַעַל ('unfaithfulness') and מעל ('to act unfaithfully') to describe Saul in 1 Chr 10:13. These words connect Saul to Achar, the troubler of Israel (1 Chr 2:7), and to the reason Israel and Judah were taken into exile (1 Chr 5:25; 9:1).

*Israel*. The nation or people group of Israel is a supporting character in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9, acting as an entourage of sorts for David and Solomon. They support these kings and their endeavors to worship YHWH. (All-) Israel is connected intimately to David and makes him king (1 Chr 11:1, 10). They recognize David's God-given role as their shepherd (1 Chr 11:2). Mighty men of Israel join David's armed forces (1 Chr 11:10-47), and the tribes of Israel join David both in the wilderness and at Hebron (1 Chr 12:1-41[40]). Later, David charges the leaders of Israel to support Solomon (1 Chr 22:17-19). The leaders of Israel give freely towards the temple construction when prompted by David (1 Chr 29:6-9). All the assembly of Israel pay homage to YHWH and the king (1 Chr 29:20) and then celebrate and anoint Solomon as king in his father's place (1 Chr 29:22). In Solomon's reign, the Chronicler notes how all-Israel obeys Solomon and pledges their allegiance to him (1 Chr 29:23-24). The leaders of all-Israel accompany Solomon to Gibeon to offer sacrifices at the altar there (2 Chr 1:2-5). All-Israel joins Solomon for the arrival of the ark into the temple (2 Chr 5:2-6) and stands with Solomon at the temple's dedication (2 Chr 6:3, 12-13). All the sons of Israel witness heavenly fire descending and the temple full of God's glory and respond with worship, celebration, and feasting (2 Chr 7:3, 8). Israelites serve in Solomon's military (2 Chr 8:9). The Queen of Sheba connects God's love for Israel to Solomon's kingship (2 Chr 9:8).

*God*. Throughout 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9, God is an active, multi-faceted character. He delivers punishment to those who break his commands, do not meet his standards, and do not seek him (1 Chr 10:13-14; 13:10; 21:7-14). However, he also relents from calamity (1 Chr 21:15). God delivers and helps those who are his and who honor him (e.g., 1 Chr 11:14; 12:19[18]; 13:14; 14:10, 14-17; 18:6, 13). The psalm in 1 Chr 16:8-36 highlights many attributes of God, including his faithfulness, miraculous power, and protective nature. The psalm also mentions God's election of his people. This theme of election runs throughout 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9. God chooses kings, groups of people, nations, his temple, and Jerusalem (Knoppers, 2015). Jonker writes, "An emphasis on Yahweh's active initiative in both kingship and temple building seems to be a prominent feature of the Chronicler's narrative" (2010b:295). YHWH is intimately connected to Israel and remains faithful to her and to his promises to her (e.g., 1 Chr 15:14; 17:9-10, 24; 23:25; 29:10; 2 Chr 6:4, 14; 7:10).

*David*. David is one of the main protagonists of Chronicles and a round, dynamic character. David experiences many emotions in this literary unit, including joy (1 Chr 12:40-41[39-40]; 15:16; 29:17), anger (1 Chr 13:11), and fear (1 Chr 13:12; 21:30). The Chronicler displays multiple characteristics for David and shows David's development as a person. David is chosen by God, has a deep concern for holiness and worship according to God's commands, and corrects his mistakes by repentance from sin. He becomes king not by lineage or marriage but by divine will (Knoppers, 2004b:530-531; cf. Jonker, 2010b:293; Van Den Eynde, 2001:426; Knoppers, 2015:152-153; see, e.g., 1 Chr 10:14; 17:7-10; 28:4; 2 Chr 6:6). David's concern for holiness can be seen in his multiple communications with and worship of God (Balentine, 1997:260; see, e.g., 1 Chr 14:8-17; 16:1-4, 8-36; 17:16-27; 29:10-22) as well as his adherence to the Torah and his commands that others follow the Torah (Van Den Eynde, 2001:426; see, e.g., 1 Chr 15:13, 15; 16:1-4, 40; 24:19; 28:19-21). Even after the two prominent examples of mistakes by David (incorrect movement of the ark in 1 Chr 13; census in 1 Ch 21), David acknowledges his mistake, repents, and responds with worship (1 Chr 15:2-15; 21:8, 16-22:1). David's mistakes and repentance do not negate his idyllic image in the Chronicler's portrayal but rather accentuate it.

> The image of David as the model of a repentant sinner is a constituent element in the Chronicler's depiction of David. The David of the census story is a person of confession and supplication *par excellence*, a human sinner who repents, seeks forgiveness, intercedes on behalf of his people, and ultimately secures the site of the future temple… 1 Chronicles 21 is an example of, rather than the exception to, the Chronicler's idealization of David (Knoppers, 1995:469-470).

Lastly, David does much to prepare his son for the kingship and the temple's construction. "Near the end of his long and illustrious life, David labors intensively to prepare the kingdom for the rule of his divinely-appointed successor" (Knoppers, 2015:152).

*Solomon*. Solomon is another main protagonist in Chronicles. However, his character is static and straightforward. Solomon is well-revered by the Chronicler and by other characters in the narrative. However, the reader does not see Solomon experience any emotion, nor does his character experience much change. He is deservedly well-known and well-regarded in Chronicles for his building of the temple and his wisdom and wealth.

Solomon is paralleled to his father David in many ways. Solomon is chosen by God (1 Chr 28:5-6, 10; 29:1; cf. Knoppers, 2015:141, 145, 154, 157), is noted to have YHWH with him (2 Chr 1:1; cf. 1 Chr 11:9), and is the only other character in this literary unit to have his prayers recorded (2 Chr 1:8-10; 6:14-42; cf. Balentine, 1997:251-252). He builds the temple for which his father prepared so extensively (2 Chr 5:1) and experiences fire descending from heaven to confirm the sacrifices' acceptance (2 Chr 7:1; cf. 1 Chr 21:26). Solomon is honored by God (2 Chr 1:11-12) and by other nations (2 Chr 9:1, 14, 23-24, 26; cf. 1 Chr 14:1; 17:7; 18:1-6, 9-13; 19:19). However, unlike David, Solomon's wisdom and wealth are unmatched (2 Chr 9:3-4, 9-11, 14, 22).

In contrast to David, the Chronicler does not portray Solomon as a repentant sinner. One could quickly respond that Solomon cannot be noted as repenting from sin if he is not noted as having sinned. The Chronicler's portrayal of Solomon is overwhelmingly positive; he is never overtly tied to any sinful activity by the narrator, and Solomon never acknowledges or laments any sin of his own. Wright describes the Chronicler's depiction of Solomon as a "glowing portrait" (2011:147).

How does this portrayal of Solomon comport with what is said of Solomon in 1 Kings? Hays (2003) argues well for a subtle negative critique of Solomon throughout 1 Kgs 1-10 culminating in the overt critique in 1 Kgs 11 based on Deut 17:14-20. Prior to Hays, Burns argues along the same lines regarding comments of Solomon's accumulation of wealth, horses, and wives in 1 Kgs 10:23-11:43 // 2 Chr 1:14-17; 9:22-31 and observes that the Chronicler was not willing to include the denunciation of Solomon's wives from 1 Kgs 11 (1991:29-33, 37-38, 43). Klein states that the Chronicler includes material from 1 Kgs 10:26-29 in 2 Chr 1:14-17 "in order to show that Solomon had ample riches to build the temple… and to show the fulfillment of God's promise of riches, wealth, and honor in v. 12 " (2012:26). Other commentators concur (e.g., Japhet, 1993:532; Hicks, 2001:265; Jonker, 2013a:173-174). Klein concedes shortly thereafter that 1 Kgs 10:26-29 could be "an implicit denunciation of Solomon, but the account in 2 Chr 1:14–17 surely redounds to Solomon's glory and honor" (2012:26). Klein's (and others') argument is strong that the context

preceding and following 2 Chr 1:14-17 inclines the reader to see the use of 1 Kgs 10:26-29 there as evidence of God's promises being fulfilled.

Even so, the Chronicler has included the material from 1 Kgs 10 in both 2 Chr 1:14-17 and 9:22-28 and has added or altered material in 2 Chr 1:16-17 pushing those two verses closer to Deut 17.[72] There are only five passages in the HB/OT that include the terms כֶּסֶף ('silver'), זָהָב ('gold'), סוּס ('horse'), and מִצְרַיִם ('Egypt') within two verses of one another: Deut 17:16-17; 1 Kgs 10:25-29; 2 Kgs 7:6-10; 2 Chr 1:15-17; 9:24-28. The battle and spoils context of 2 Kgs 7:6-10 makes that passage disconnected from the other four passages that each discuss a king and his accumulation of certain types of wealth from peaceful sources. We highlight the added or altered material and the significant lexical connections between these four passages in Appendix E. The Chronicler adds וְאֶת־הַזָּהָב ('and gold…') in 1 Chr 1:15. First Kings 10:27 only mentions silver, while Deut 17:17 mentions both silver and gold. The Chronicler has changed the opening verbs in 1 Kgs 10:29 from *Qal* to *Hiphil* and from singular to plural in 2 Chr 1:17. The subjects of the first two verbs in 1 Kgs 10:29 has changed from מֶרְכָּבָה ('chariot') and the second clause's וְסוּס ('horse') to the conjugated "they" in 2 Chr 1:17; the referent for "they" is סֹחֲרֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ ('the king's traders') in the previous verse.[73] Deuteronomy 17:16 says that future kings of Israel are not to acquire many horses nor cause the people to return to Egypt to acquire many horses. By changing the subject from the items imported (1 Kgs 10:29) to the king's traders (2 Chr 1:17), the Chronicler has now more clearly highlighted that Solomon has caused his people to go to Egypt to acquire horses (and chariots).

As noted above, both Burns (1991) and Hays (2003) have demonstrated that 1 Kgs 10:26-29 is indeed an indictment of Solomon. The context of a promise of riches and wealth in 2 Chr 1:12 does not negate that Solomon's manifold silver and gold and accumulation of horses (including through sending his traders to Egypt) is contrary to the stipulations of Deut 17.[74] It appears then that as the author of Kings has subtly indicted Solomon's riches and horses in 1 Kgs 10, the Chronicler

---

[72] Japhet notes regarding the Chronicler's addition of "gold" in 2 Chr 1:15 but not 9:27: "As with other examples of Chronistic reworking, this addition is not introduced into the same verse when it reappears in 2 Chron. 9:27" (1993:533).

[73] Japhet notes this subject change (without mentioning the second clause's subject and elided verbs) and labels the plural subject of each verb in 2 Chr 1:17 as "the indefinite 'they'" (1993:533). She does not note that the referent is in the previous verse.

[74] If we understand Solomon's characterization correctly here, Solomon would not be alone in the HB/OT as one taking a promise of blessing from God and seeking its fulfillment in incorrect ways. One prominent example of a HB/OT character seeking a promise's fulfillment incorrectly is Abraham and his fathering of Ishmael with Hagar (Gen 16).

has done so as well in 2 Chr 1:15-17 (and by proxy in 2 Chr 9:24-28). The Chronicler has indicated through his alterations that he has owned the allusion and not just copied his source.[75] This does not negate the overall positive image the Chronicler has presented of Solomon, but it does temper his portrayal a little.

*Levites*. The Levites as a whole, as well as the group of Levites identified as the "sons of Aaron", are not main protagonists in this literary unit but are still vitally important. They are static characters who demonstrate faithfulness in their sacred duties (2 Chr 8:14-15). They are portrayed "as the essential custodians of the covenant relationship between Yahweh and Israel" (Jonker, 2015:424, cf. 426). They are chosen by God to move the ark of the covenant and to minister before YHWH (1 Chr 15:2; cf. Knoppers, 2015:149). Their members and functions are listed in great detail (e.g., 1 Chr 15:4-11, 17-24; 16:5-7; 23-27; 28:21; 2 Chr 5:4-5) and are portrayed as leading the celebration and praise of YHWH (e.g., 1 Chr 15:16, 27; 16:4). The "sons of Aaron" are a subset of the Levites who are singled out for their important role (1 Chr 24:19; 27:17) and seen in this literary unit as co-laborers with the other Levites (Jonker, 2010a:80-81).

*Foreign Forces*. The might of the foreign forces in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 appears dependent on whether God is with Israel at the time of the military or political interaction. The Philistines claim victory in 1 Chr 10 because God sought to bring justice to Saul (1 Chr 10:13-14). The remainder of this literary unit sees foreign forces defeated (whether the Philistines, Syrians, Moabites, or others; cf. 1 Chr 11:14; 14:8-17; 18:1-11; 19:6-19; 20:1-7) and foreign kings appearing subservient to David and Solomon, both of whom are honored by God (1 Chr 14:1; 2 Chr 2:2-15[3-16]; 4:11-17; 8:18; 9:1-10, 13-14, 22-24). The foreign forces and kings are flat characters in this portion of the narrative and appear to be present for contrast as (mostly) inferior opponents to Israel and her kings.

### 5.4.3 – Characterization in 2 Chr 10-36

*David and Solomon*. In 2 Chr 10-36, David is mentioned by name forty-one times and Solomon twelve times.[76] The character of David returns to being a flat character as he was in 1 Chr 1-9, and Solomon continues to be flat and static as he has been throughout the narrative. The Chronicler explicitly uses the actions of David as the standard for evaluating kings five times (2 Chr 17:3; 28:1; 29:2; 34:2, 3) and the actions of both David and Solomon once (2 Chr 11:17). There are

---

[75] The Chronicler's use of Deut 17 for a negative moral evaluation is similar to other such examples we have examined in this study. See 4.3.1.2 above. This negative moral evaluation in 2 Chr 1:14-17 also begs the question of why did Solomon, in his first acts once home in Jerusalem according to the Chronicler's ordering, seek to accumulate more military strength when he was declared to be the "man of rest" in 1 Chr 22:9 and his father had presumably left him a sizable military?

[76] Of the forty-one times "David" appears, the location "the city of David" (עִיר דָּוִיד) within Jerusalem is mentioned twelve times.

a number of instances where the Chronicler uses an association with David as an implicit positive evaluation (e.g., 2 Chr 23:9, 18; 29:25, 26, 27, 30; 35:15) or an implicit negative evaluation (e.g., 2 Chr 13:6; 21:12). The Chronicler also uses associations with Solomon for an implicit positive evaluation (2 Chr 30:26; 35:3) or negative evaluation (2 Chr 12:9; 13:6, 7). Twice the Chronicler uses an association with both David and Solomon for a positive evaluation (2 Chr 35:4) or a negative evaluation (2 Chr 33:7). An interesting dynamic with Solomon's characterization in 2 Chr 10-36 is the indirect negative comments said about him in 10:4 and acknowledged later in 10:9-11, 14. What makes these comments especially interesting is that they are made by other characters and not by the narrator. They appear to contradict what the narrator has stated earlier in 2 Chr 2:16–17[17–18]; 8:7–10 (cf. Klein, 2012:157-158; Japhet, 1993:652-653). They are made by the people of Israel who are about to rebel, by the king whose unwise actions are about to lead to the split of his kingdom, and by immature and unwise counselors who push the king to unwise actions. The characters making these comments are not held up by the narrator as trustworthy. An untrustworthy person can still say something true, but their characterization gives the reader pause regarding their comments about Solomon's character. Ultimately, the Chronicler looks positively on both David and Solomon in 2 Chr 10-36. Based on quantity alone, we may say that the Chronicler seems to hold David in higher regard than Solomon.

*Israel, Judah, and All-Israel*. When the northern and southern kingdoms split in 2 Chr 10, the reader might rightly wonder what this separation means for the status of "all-Israel" who worshipped YHWH so faithfully under David and Solomon. The Chronicler does not narrate a full reunification anywhere in the remainder of the book. Nevertheless, the names "Israel", "Judah", and "all-Israel" see overlap throughout the rest of Chronicles. "All Israel" unites in making Rehoboam king (2 Chr 10:1), but "Israel" is in rebellion against the house of David throughout the remainder of the narrative (2 Chr 10:19). The word of YHWH indicates that "all Israel" can be in Judah and Benjamin (2 Chr 11:2-3). Members "from all the tribes of Israel" (מִכֹּל שִׁבְטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל) who seek YHWH come to Jerusalem and strengthen Judah for three years (2 Chr 11:16-17). When Rehoboam later abandons the Torah, "all Israel" joins him in his folly (12:1). The changing nature of Israel's and Judah's appellations continues throughout the rest of the book. The narrator indicates in 2 Chr 30:1 that Hezekiah sends messages to "all Israel and Judah", potentially understanding them as separate entities (cf. Klein, 2012:431-432). Yet, later in 2 Chr 31:1, the Chronicler notes that "all Israel who were found" (כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל הַנִּמְצְאִים) remove idols throughout the southern kingdom and parts of the northern kingdom. Similar to 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9, Israel, Judah, and all-Israel function in support roles for the various kings in 2 Chr 10-36.

We see throughout 2 Chr 10-36 that the members of Israel, Judah, and all-Israel have shifting loyalties. Sometimes those loyalties are positive (e.g., 2 Chr 11:3-4, 16-17; 15:15; 31:1, 5-6; 34:33; 35:18) and sometimes negative (2 Chr 12:1-2; 13:15; 21:11 28:6, 9, 23). Generally, these members do well in obeying YHWH when their king is and do poorly when their king is disobeying.[77] They can be an imperfect people (e.g., when they offered sacrifices to YHWH at illegitimate high places, 2 Chr 33:17), but the invitation to worship YHWH is open to any who would come (2 Chr 30:1, 5-6). The Chronicler shows the reader that many different members make up God's people (2 Chr 30:25). We see great significance in Cyrus's decree inviting "whoever among you from *all/any* of [YHWH's] people" (מִכָּל־עַמּוֹ, 2 Chr 36:23). This ending returns the reader to the universality of the genealogies that started the book, showing that "all-Israel" is more than an "inner-Israelite understanding" and connects both to the past and to the Chronicler's present (Jonker, 2012a:329).

*Kings of Judah.* The only mention of מַלְכֵי יְהוּדָה ('the kings of Judah'), aside from as part of a document's title (2 Chr 25:26; 28:26; 32:32), is negative and in reference to buildings in the temple complex "which the kings of Judah had damaged" (2 Chr 34:11).[78] Japhet suggests that the reference is to Manasseh and Amon but intentionally left generic by the Chronicler because of how Manasseh changed (1993:1028; cf. Klein, 2012:501). We look then at the individual kings together and how the Chronicler evaluates them as characters to see what patterns or themes emerge.[79]

A primary way the Chronicler evaluates a king of Judah is by saying what he did (either right or wicked things) in the eyes of YHWH (בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה). The phrase is used seventeen times of the kings in 2 Chr 10-36, typically at the start of a king's reign.[80] However, the Chronicler does not use the phrase with each king.[81] Also, sometimes the evaluation comes with a qualification that tempers a positive evaluation (e.g., 2 Chr 24:2; 25:2). Some of the kings who receive this evaluation (either positive or negative) at one phase of their life do not stay that way throughout the remainder of their life. We must look elsewhere to understand more fully the Chronicler's evaluations.

---

[77] One clear exception is found in the reign of Jotham. Jotham follows YHWH while his people continue in wickedness (2 Chr 27:3; cf. 3.2.9).

[78] The *Hiphil* הִשְׁחִיתוּ is an active verb. We agree with Japhet (1993:1028) and match that active voice in the translation of "had damaged" rather than the more common passive translation "had let go to ruin".

[79] See Appendix F for a table of the Chronicler's presentation of the kings of Judah in 2 Chr 10-36.

[80] 2 Chr 14:1; 20:32; 21:6; 22:4; 24:2; 25:2; 26:4; 27:2; 28:1; 29:2; 33:2, 6, 22; 34:2; 36:5, 9, 12. King Jehoshaphat is the only king (of those who receive this type of evaluation) to receive the evaluation at the end of his reign. King Manasseh is the only king of whom the phrase is used twice; both are negative. The phrase is also used by King Hezekiah in 2 Chr 29:6 when he is reflecting on previous generations.

[81] Kings Rehoboam, Abijah, and Jehoahaz do not receive this particular type of evaluation.

Other details from the Chronicler may shed light on how he evaluates a king, but in-and-of-themselves, they are not conclusive. The length of a king's reign does not directly correlate to a positive or negative evaluation by the Chronicler, nor does the number of verses covering a king's life. Three very good kings (Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, and Josiah) have shorter reigns than relatively bad kings (Joash and Uzziah). The three longest stories (by the number of verses) are of the three best-regarded kings (Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, and Josiah), but the fourth-longest story is about Rehoboam, a relatively bad king. Rehoboam's story is longer than the stories of Asa, Abijah, and Jotham, all good or relatively good kings. Sometimes, the Chronicler provides extra details in the burial notices for the kings (such as the specific location or the nature of burial) that may assist evaluation (e.g., whether or not a king was buried in the city of David or in the tombs of the kings), but not all of the kings receive a burial notice.[82] Similarly, the Chronicler sometimes inserts additional information into a summary at the end of a king's life (e.g., 2 Chr 24:27; 32:32; 33:18-19; 35:26-27), but this is not consistent, and some kings do not have such a summary at all.[83] We also note that the faithfulness (or lack thereof) of a king's father does not necessitate a similar faithfulness (or lack thereof) for the son.[84]

There may be many ways one can understand how the Chronicler evaluates the kings of Judah.[85] However, for our purposes here, we agree with Balentine, who writes: "From [the Chronicler's] perspective the kings who follow Solomon succeed or fail in direct proportion to their faithfulness to God. Such faithfulness is recorded in a variety of ways, but particularly in relation to the king's responsibility to seek God" (1997:263). Keywords in various positive and negative comments made by the narrator and trustworthy characters in Chronicles greatly assist the reader in understanding how the Chronicler evaluates a king; examples include דרשׁ ('to seek') or בקשׁ ('to seek'), set in either the positive or negative, as well as מעל ('to be unfaithful').[86] The Chronicler does not paint any of the kings in 2 Chr 10-36 as perfect or without flaws. However, certain kings do rise above or sink below others in the Chronicler's moral evaluations. The below table offers an assessment of the Chronicler's moral characterizations of the kings in 2 Chr 10-36.[87]

---

[82] Kings Amon, Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah do not receive burial notices.

[83] Kings Jehoram, Ahaziah, Amon, Jehoahaz, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah do not receive such summaries.

[84] E.g., Jehoshaphat (very good) is followed by Jehoram (bad), and Ahaz (bad) is followed by Hezekiah (very good).

[85] See, e.g., Evans's 2010 article on the Chronicler's temple despoliation notices.

[86] Cf. the ideological perspective about seeking YHWH and its association to David in 5.5.2.

[87] We recognize the subjective nature of such assessments, and much like the nature of allusion, these evaluations can only be argued for rather than proven (cf. 2.1 above). We offer the following rubric:

| King | Moral Characterization |
|---|---|
| Rehoboam | Mixed, Bad |
| Abijah | Good |
| Asa | Mixed, Good |
| Jehoshaphat | Very Good |
| Jehoram | Bad |
| Ahaziah | Bad |
| Joash | Mixed, Bad |
| Amaziah | Mixed, Bad |
| Uzziah | Mixed, Bad |
| Jotham | Good |
| Ahaz | Bad |
| Hezekiah | Very Good |
| Manasseh | Mixed, Good[88] |
| Amon | Bad |
| Josiah | Very Good |
| Jehoahaz | n/a[89] |
| Jehoiakim | Bad |
| Jehoiachin | Bad |
| Zedekiah | Bad |

Table 3 – The Moral Characterization of the Kings of Judah in 2 Chr 10-36

Some of the kings are complex, dynamic characters who experience change during their reigns (e.g., Manasseh), while others are relatively flat and static characters (e.g., Jotham and Jehoiakim).

*God*. YHWH continues his high activity level in 2 Chr 10-36, both in the battles of his people and the lives of Judah's kings. God's activity consists of both "positive" (for his people in blessing

- Very Good – much praise from the narrator and/or trusted characters and, relative to that praise, very little negative evaluation
- Good – some praise and relatively little negative evaluation
- Mixed, Good – both positive and negative evaluations; overall, the evaluation seems more positive than negative
- Mixed, Bad – both positive and negative evaluations; overall, the evaluation seems more negative than positive
- Bad – kings whose negative evaluations far outnumber and outweigh their positive evaluation(s), if any

[88] The Chronicler frames Manasseh as a man of terrible sin who has changed by humbling himself (2 Chr 33:12, 19, 23). He is also the only king who is noted twice as doing wicked things in the eyes of YHWH. While one could argue (perhaps strongly) for a "Mixed, Bad" assessment for Manasseh, we suggest "Mixed, Good" because the Chronicler discusses his humbling *after* discussing his terrible sins in both 2 Chr 33:19, 23, even specifying in 33:19 his sins occurred לִפְנֵי הִכָּנְעוֹ ('before he humbled himself'). We agree with Ben Zvi: "To imagine the Manasseh of old was also to recall that both the good and bad deeds must be remembered by the community and that the good do not cancel the memory of the bad, even if explicitly imagined as 'undoing' the bad" (2013:137).

[89] The Chronicler does not provide any sort of overt evaluation of Jehoahaz. The Chronicler omits the evaluation of Jehoahaz from his *Vorlage* here, 2 Kgs 23:32. Klein wonders if it was an accidental omission by the Chronicler (2012:536), while Japhet attributes the omission to scribal error (1993:1063).

and grace) and "negative" (against his people in judgment) actions. God responds positively to those who humble themselves (e.g., 2 Chr 12:6-7, 12; 32:26; 33:12-13; 34:27); defeats his people's enemies (e.g., 2 Chr 13:15-16, 18, 20; 14:12; 20:22, 29; 26:7; 28:19); gives peace and rest (e.g., 2 Chr 14:5[6]; 15:15; 20:30); rewards or honors those who seek him (e.g., 2 Chr 17:5; 26:5; 27:6); tries to draw his people back to him (e.g., 2 Chr 24:19; 36:15-17); and provides for and inspires people to act on his behalf (e.g., 2 Chr 29:36; 30:12; 36:22). Conversely, God responds negatively to those who are unfaithful to him (e.g., 2 Chr 11:2; 12:5, 7, 12; 15:6; 20:37); arranges events behind the scenes when judgment is warranted (e.g., 2 Chr 10:15; 18:19-22; 22:7; 25:20); and opposes those who do not humble themselves (e.g., 2 Chr 33:23-24; 36:12-21).

The Chronicler also emphasizes key characteristics of God in 2 Chr 10-36. The Chronicler uses some variation of the phrase אֱלֹהֵי אָב ('God of their/his/ours/your fathers') five times in 1 Chr 1 – 2 Chr 9 but twenty-three times in 2 Chr 10-36.[90] This phrase gets used in connection to both the northern and southern kingdoms. The Chronicler seems to emphasize in this literary unit that both Israel and Judah have an intimate connection to God and to their shared past. The breaking of the kingdom did not undo that connection. Related to that, Abijah asserts that the kingdom belongs to YHWH. It has been placed in the hands of the sons of David, but it ultimately belongs to YHWH (2 Chr 13:2). The narrator states plainly that God's covenant with David is not undone by a king's unfaithfulness (2 Chr 21:6-7). God is faithful to his covenant. Three times, the Chronicler asserts truths about God through men speaking on behalf of God.[91] Thus they are statements that can be trusted: (1) If people seek God, God will be found. If people reject God, God will reject them (2 Chr 15:2); (2) YHWH sees all and supports those are devoted to him (2 Chr 16:9); and (3) God has the power to lift people up in battle or bring them to ruin (2 Chr 25:8).

*Levites and Priests*. The Levites and priests play an important and visible role during the reigns of David and Solomon (see 5.4.2 above). After the kingdom splits during the reign of Rehoboam, their visibility in the narrative is often determined by the faithfulness of each successive king. Typically, when a king who is faithful to YHWH reigns, the Levites and priests play a more

---

[90] 1 Chr 5:25; 12:18; 28:9; 29:20; 2 Chr 7:22; 11:16; 13:12, 18; 14:3[4]; 15:12; 17:4; 19:4; 20:6, 33; 21:10; 24:18, 24; 28:6, 9, 25; 29:5; 30:7, 19, 22; 33:12; 34:32, 33; 36:15. אֱלֹהֵי אָב is prefaced by יְהוָה two times in 1 Chr 1 – 2 Chr 9 (1 Chr 29:20; 2 Chr 7:22) and nineteen times in 2 Chr 10-36 (2 Chr 11:16; 13:12, 18; 14:3[4]; 15:12; 19:4; 20:6; 21:10; 24:18, 24; 28:6, 9, 25; 29:5; 30:7, 19, 22; 34:33; 36:15). In addition to the twenty-eight uses of אֱלֹהֵי אָב, the Chronicler uses יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אָבִינוּ ('YHWH God of Israel our father', 1 Chr 29:10), יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי דָּוִיד אָבִיךָ ('YHWH God of David your father', 2 Chr 21:12), and לֵאלֹהֵי דָּוִיד אָבִיו ('God of David his father', 2 Chr 34:3).

[91] Azariah on whom had come the Spirit of God, 2 Chr 15:2; Hanani the seer, 16:9; an unnamed man of God, 2 Chr 25:8.

prominent role in the story. When a king is not faithful, the Levites and priests appear much less frequently. These times of royal unfaithfulness do not lessen the importance of these characters. On the contrary, 2 Chr 10-36 accentuates their importance. Jehoiada the priest (a trustworthy character who, among other things, leads the installation of Joash and the downfall of the wicked queen Athaliah) declares the priests and ministering Levites "holy" (קֹדֶשׁ, 2 Chr 23:6). King Hezekiah (one of the better kings of Judah; see Table 3 above) reaffirms their status as chosen by God (29:11). This chosen status does not negate their need to serve and obey; rather, it entails an expected adherence to the commands of YHWH and care for the temple, which, at times, they fail to do (Knoppers, 2015:150-151, 164; cf. 2 Chr 24:5; 29:34; 30:15). The Levites and priests develop different characteristics in this literary unit and are thus no longer static like in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9. The Levites continue to serve in their expected assortment of duties (especially music), and the priests continue in their sacrificial duties, both according to the Torah and to the commands of David (e.g., 2 Chr 20:19; 26:18; 29:24-25, 30; 30:16, 21, 27; 31:2, 4; 34:9, 12-13; 35:2-3, 15). However, 2 Chr 10-36 sees the list of Levitical duties expand from 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9. Twice the Spirit of God comes on a Levite so that the Levite may encourage or issue a warning (2 Chr 20:14; 24:20). The wife of a Levite, Huldah, the prophetess, delivers the climactic message of 2 Chr 10-36 (34:22-28; see 5.3.3 *Plot Movement* above). The Levites are sent out to teach (2 Chr 17:8) and are set up as judges (2 Chr 19:11). The Levites develop a heart to serve YHWH which, perhaps surprisingly, seems to surpass that of the priests themselves (2 Chr 29:34). This leads to non-priestly Levites assisting in sacrificial duties that would typically be reserved for priests only (2 Chr 30:17, 22; 35:1-14). Jonker summarizes this significance well:

> The development is thus clear: Whereas the book of Chronicles reflects in its earlier parts the ideological position that the priests were the consecrated ones and that the Levites played a supporting role, the position changes particularly from the Hezekiah narrative where the Levites become the primary consecrated ones who assist in the slaughtering and offering of the Passover lambs… It therefore seems that the relationship between the Aaronide priests and the Levites grows from a position of subordination to a coordinate relationship. Towards the end of the book, particularly as seen in the Passover narratives in 2 Chr 30 and 35, the Levites occupy at least an equal position with the Aaronide priests, and in some cases are seen as more obedient in terms of their consecration (2020:466).[92]

[92] Jonker observes later in his article that this development in Chronicles shows that holiness is related to one's active obedience to YHWH and his commands rather than one's status, role, or familial line (2020:473).

We also observe additional roles and characteristics for the priests not seen earlier in Chronicles. The priests must prevent a king from disrupting the sanctity of the holy place (2 Chr 26:17-20). The priests recover from their insufficient number of consecrated members and consecrate themselves to handle the needed workload (2 Chr 30:24). A priest is also the one who discovers the scroll of the Torah of YHWH and sees that it gets to the king (2 Chr 34:14; cf. Jiang, 2019:449).

*Foreign Forces*. Up into the reign of Josiah, the foreign forces in 2 Chr 10-35 are much the same as they have been throughout Chronicles: flat characters who are instruments operating at the direction of YHWH. If the people of God are unfaithful, foreign forces are victorious and implement God's judgment (e.g., 2 Chr 12:2; 21:10, 16; 24:23-24; 25:22; 28:9, 17; 33:11; 36:6, 10, 17). If the people of God are faithful, the foreign forces are afraid and/or defeated (e.g., 2 Chr 13:15; 14:14; 17:10; 20:1-30; 27:5; 32:1-22).

From the end of Josiah's reign through the end of Chronicles, the picture of foreign kings (and their forces) changes. "A close look at the presentation of foreign monarchs in Chronicles from Josiah's time onward reveals that, in the absence of an independent Judean state or a legitimate, obedient Davidic king on the throne, the foreign kings after Josiah fulfill the role of Yahweh's vice-regent" (Evans, 2010:42-43). Neco of Egypt (2 Chr 35:22), Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon (2 Chr 36:6-7, 12-21; cf. 1 Chr 5:41[6:15]), and Cyrus of Persia (2 Chr 36:22-23) all operate at the prompting of God. Neco speaks on behalf of God (2 Chr 35:22), and Cyrus states he is commissioned by God (2 Chr 36:23).

## 5.5 – Perspective

As a final analytical tool, we evaluate the narrative of 1-2 Chronicles with its point of view or perspective in mind. We examine not just what the Chronicler presents but the way he presents it. An analysis of the perspective of 1-2 Chronicles could easily fill up the pages of a full-length commentary, so we limit ourselves here to major patterns or themes and representative examples present in the text.

### 5.5.1 – Perspective in 1 Chr 1-9

The narration's point of view is entirely in the third person in 1 Chr 1-9. There is virtually no dialogue to speak of; the common verb אמר ('to say') only appears twice in 1 Chr 4:9, 10 as part of a child's naming and a prayer. These opening chapters can seem to the modern reader more of a transmission of information rather than the telling of a story. The six components of perspective (see 2.4 above) indicate that this section of Chronicles functions as a high-level summary of the events important to the narrator.

We discussed the locative and temporal settings above (see 5.2.1.1 and 5.2.1.2), so we add only brief comments here. The *spatial* perspective is mostly distant. To use a movie camera analogy, the narrator primarily uses a wide lens to stay pulled back, rarely zooming in close(r) to the action (cf. Yamasaki, 2006:90-92). The closest perspective we get is the focus on Jabez's episode; the reader is brought close to hear Jabez's mother name him and then Jabez's prayer. We are then pulled back with the summative statement: "And God brought about what he [Jabez] asked" (1 Chr 4:10).[93] The reader receives details about the beauty of certain lands (1 Chr 4:40), but the viewpoint there is still pulled far back to see the whole land at once. Lastly, the reader receives summations of battles (1 Chr 4:41-43; 5:6, 10, 18-22, 26; 7:21; 8:6-7, 13), but even the most detailed account of one army crying out to God stays at a very summative level (1 Chr 5:18-22). We are given no details of the plea nor the battle itself.

Regarding the *temporal* perspective, the Chronicler narrates 1 Chr 1-9 from a point in time after the exile. The inclusion of post-exilic generations in the lists in 1 Chr 3 and 9 indicates this post-exilic perspective, reinforced by the phrase עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה ('until this day'; 1 Chr 4:41, 43; 5:26). As we observed above, the pacing is generally swift. With only a few instances of a slowed pace amongst multiple chapters covering hundreds of years, one understands that this section of Chronicles is intended to provide a summary of a great deal of time, namely, from the start of humanity until the time of Israel's return from exile. The distant spatial perspective accentuates this.

The *psychological*, *phraseological*, and *ideological* planes further signal a pulled-back perspective for 1 Chr 1-9. The narrator rarely provides insight into the minds of his human characters; the Chronicler provides only two explanations for specific names (1 Chr 4:9; 7:23) and three motivations for movement (1 Chr 4:39; 7:21, 22). We discuss the narrator's insight into his divine character below. With so little speech in this opening section, we may say that there is little to no phraseological perspective present. There is no significant opportunity for a character's perspective to be offered. The perspective in 1 Chr 1-9 is almost entirely from the narrator. What characters are called is typically a significant aspect of the phraseological plane (Yamasaki, 2006:92-93), yet here in 1 Chr 1-9, the two instances of characters naming other characters are quickly overturned with an answered prayer and a daughter building cities (1 Chr 4:9-10; 7:23-24). It appears in this section of Chronicles that names do not have the power that they do elsewhere in the HB/OT (cf. Barr, 1969; Haber, 1999). The narrator operates as all-knowing, even to the point of understanding the actions and motives of God (1 Chr 2:3; 5:20, 26, 5:41[6:15], 9:1). This

[93] There is at least one example of the Chronicler using word order to indicate proximity to one character over another (1 Chr 2:3-4; see Klein, 2015:3-13; cf. Yamasaki, 2016:42-43), but the overall degree of detail in 1 Chr 1-9 is rather low, thus indicating a distant spatial plane of perspective.

knowledge of God aligns the narrator with God. This connection between the narrator and God improves the narrator's ethos with his reader(s), showing the audience that the narrator speaks on behalf of God. Thus, the audience can trust him throughout the remainder of the narrative.

Regarding the *informational* plane, we have observed that 1 Chr 1-9 is composed of extensive summative material and brief vignettes. Since there are no extended scenes in 1 Chr 1-9 in which the reader can evaluate how much information a character possesses, there is no moment in the narrative when the audience knows they possess a different level of information than the human characters, nor when the audience may join the human characters in receiving information when they do (cf. Yamasaki, 2016:41-42). Without the opportunity to identify with human characters in this way, there is an inherent distance created between the reader and the human characters. This separation adds to the distant feeling of these opening chapters and the summative impression 1 Chr 1-9 leaves.

One issue to be considered on the informational plane then is how the narrator provides information to the reader and how much the narrator expects the reader to have already. The sequence of rapid-fire genealogies (and perhaps even some of the vignettes) implies the knowledgeable reader needs an awareness of the remainder of the HB/OT to keep pace with the narrator. One example is the first mention of exile. If the reader is not familiar with the history of Israel, especially as recorded in the HB/OT, then the mention of the exile in 1 Chr 5:6 is striking. There is no overt rising action to lead to this event; up to this point in the narrative, it has been a series of names (even up to and past the exile in 1 Chr 3) with the occasional brief mention of a fight between people groups or a personal story of blessing or impropriety. Then, without warning, the Chronicler mentions Beerah and locates him in time with reference to the Assyrian exile. There is no discussion of how this happened or why. Not until nineteen verses later in 5:25-26 does the narrator explain how and why the exile happened. For those interim verses, the reader unfamiliar with Israel's history is left with many unanswered questions. This happens again when Judah (and Jerusalem) are said to be carried into exile in 5:41(6:15), but the Chronicler withholds explanation until 9:1.[94] Another example is the variety of names given to the Israelite place of worship in 1 Chr 1-9. For the reader familiar with the remainder of the HB/OT, these various names carry meaning and communicate connections to other stories in Israel's past. To the unknowledgeable reader, it is a curiosity that so many different references are used. Although one can appreciate the narrative presented thus far without a thorough awareness of the HB/OT, readers may realize with these

[94] It is interesting that the mention of the exile in 5:41(6:15) is also used to locate a person in time (Jehozadak) much like Beerah in 5:6.

informational differences between them and the narrator that a knowledge of the rest of the HB/OT will enhance their appreciation of the Chronicler's work.

### 5.5.2 – Perspective in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9

The narrator's point of view continues entirely in the third person in 1 Chr – 2 Chr 9. However, there is a large amount of dialogue throughout this literary unit. Over 100 instances of first-person verbal forms appear in this literary unit. The combination of third-person narration and frequent dialogue allows for a shifting perspective throughout the narrative. This contributes to the tonal difference between 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 and 1 Chr 1-9. The six components of perspective (see 2.4 above) indicate that this section of Chronicles focuses more closely on certain characters and events important to the narrator than the high-level summary in the first literary unit.

The *spatial* movement of the narration in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 indicates a sustained focus on David, Solomon, YHWH, the Levites, and the temple (both its preparation and construction). However, each has varying degrees of narrative proximity to the reader. During King David's life, the narration stays primarily focused on him, sometimes zooming in close to report his feelings and thoughts (1 Chr 13:11-12; 14:2), his prayers (1 Chr 14:10; 17:16-27; 21:8, 17; 29:10-19), what his eyes see (1 Chr 21:16), and spoken accounts of his time in prayer (1 Chr 22:7-10; 28:2-7). The narrator gives a similar, consistent focus to Solomon once he is made king, though the narrator does not place the reader as close to Solomon. The reader is never told Solomon's thoughts or feelings (only what he says), nor what Solomon's eyes see. The reader is privy to Solomon's prayer at Gibeon and God's personal response in 2 Chr 1:7-12, as well as God's response to Solomon at night in 2 Chr 7:12-22.[95] The contents of the messages between Solomon and Huram of Tyre in 2 Chr 2 are also made known to the reader. The temple building process in 2 Chr 3-4 is narrated as if Solomon did most of the work himself, so, even if the narrator has not placed the reader close to Solomon, Solomon is still consistently in view. King Solomon helped bring about the events of 2 Chr 5, but the reader is drawn closer to the placement of the ark unfolding in the temple rather than seeing Solomon's perspective on the proceedings. The narrator moves the story with the Levites rather than Solomon (e.g., 2 Chr 5:7-14). The focus on Solomon returns with his prayer beginning in 2 Chr 6:1 and stays mostly on Solomon until the end of 2 Chr 9.

The Chronicler tells his audience YHWH's mind (and heavenly conversation) throughout the narrative. This helps the reader see how events unfold from YHWH's perspective (e.g., 1 Chr 21:15); gives the reader insight into God's sense of judgment (1 Chr 10:13-14; 13:10; 2 Chr 7:12-

[95] Admittedly, God's appearances to Solomon in 2 Chr 1:7, 11 and 7:12 put the reader closer to YHWH than Solomon, as Solomon is not the subject of the verbs in each case but the object.

22); and how God understands faithfulness and its rewards (1 Chr 13:14; 14:8-17; 15:26; 2 Chr 1:11-12; 7:12-22). Though this vantage point is not sustained in terms of duration, it does occur with regularity, repeatedly inclining the reader to return to God's perspective and share it (cf. Yamasaki, 2016:42).

The Chronicler highlights the importance of the Levites by discussing their roles and their constituents in detail. The Levites factor heavily into the events of 1 Chr 15 and 2 Chr 5. The listing of their functions and members are also given considerable narration time in 1 Chr 23-27. In 1 Chr 15, they bring the ark to the city of David. The narrator tells of their consecration, the way they carry the ark, and the joyful music surrounding them and their completion of the task. Besides these details, much of 1 Chr 15 is dedicated to listing which Levites are in attendance and who does what function in the procession. The Chronicler maintains this high level of administrative detail in the appointing of Levites to various roles for the coming temple in 1 Chr 23-27. Then at the climactic moment of the ark's placement in the temple (2 Chr 5:7-14), the audience follows the Levites' perspective as if they were with them and seeing what they saw. The reader identifies with the Levites and sees firsthand the important work they do.

Once the temple's construction commences, the reader is put into close proximity to the proceedings (2 Chr 3-4). The Chronicler describes in detail the measurements, the type of gold used, and the intricacies of the decorations. The furnishings are highlighted one by one, down to the pots, shovels, and utensils. It is as though the reader is given a grand tour. When it is time to place the ark in the temple (2 Chr 5:7-14), the reader is allowed into the Most Holy Place to see what happens. The reader is shown in close detail the grandeur and wonder of the temple, and in that display, the reader sees just how significant the temple is to the Chronicler.

The *temporal* perspective of the Chronicler in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 continues from a point in time after the exile. This is reinforced by the use of the phrase עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה ('until this day') in 1 Chr 13:11; 17:5; 2 Chr 5:9; 8:8. As noted above in 5.2.2.2, the pace in this literary unit is quick overall because much of the narrated action takes far more time to transpire in reality than the narrated time itself. However, compared to the generations-spanning pace of 1 Chr 1-9, the Chronicler has slowed his narrative pace. The pace varies considerably within 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9. As is common in a narrative, most of the verbs are in the past tense and cover events in a summative fashion. Yet, there are moments when the narrative time slows in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9, especially during various points of dialogue when the present tense is used, bringing the reader into the moment with the characters (e.g., 1 Chr 10:4; 11:1; 12:19[18]; 13:2-3; 14:10, 15:12; 19:5; 21:13; 29:15; 2 Chr 9:7; cf. Yamasaki, 2016:44).

The Chronicler regularly provides *psychological* insight into characters in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9. The narrative enters the mind of many characters and provides a sense of immediacy and proximity to those characters, allowing the reader to understand further and, in some instances, identify with the character(s). This creates a connection between the reader and the character, providing the narrator a greater opportunity to inform on an emotional level how the author wants the audience to perceive the character(s). We see multiple examples of major and minor characters into whose mind the narrator takes the reader, including: the assembly of Israel (1 Chr 13:4); Joab (1 Chr 21:6); David (1 Chr 13:11-12; 14:2; 21:16); the Ammonites (1 Chr 19:6) and Aram (1 Chr 19:19); and YHWH (1 Chr 13:10; 21:15). If one understands the use of the verb אמר (‘to say’) in 2 Chr 1:18(2:1) to mean “to decide, think, or purpose” (cf. Klein, 2012:32; ESV, RSV, KJV), then we observe one instance of entering the mind of Solomon in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9.[96] Of the two main human protagonists in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9, the narrator seems to push the reader to identify with David more than with Solomon.

On the *phraseological* plane, we comment on one example of the narrator adopting a speech pattern of one of the characters. David uses the phrase וְהָעֹשֶׁר וְהַכָּבוֹד (‘riches and honor’) in 1 Chr 29:12 in his prayer to YHWH, identifying YHWH as the source of the blessings. The narrator uses those words in his summation of David’s death in 1 Chr 29:28. Coming full circle, God then builds upon that phrase twice in 2 Chr 1:11-12 in his response to Solomon. The phrase is used three more times by the narrator in the final literary unit, twice of Jehoshaphat (2 Chr 17:5; 18:1) and once of Hezekiah (2 Chr 32:27). The use of this phrase by the narrator (and God) reminds the reader of David’s assertion that such blessings come from God, prompting further identification with David as a character (Yamasaki, 2006:92). The use of the phrase in reference to Solomon, Jehoshaphat, and Hezekiah further solidifies the connection between those men and David.

In consideration of the *ideological* plane, the narrator continues to function as all-knowing, even to the point of relaying prayers and dialogue between God and humans and understanding the actions and motives of God (as noted above in *psychological* and 5.4.2). This solidifies the reader’s trust in the narrator’s viewpoint and evaluations. We also observe at least one character who develops a point of view adopted by the narrator and encourages the reader to share that viewpoint

---

[96] If the verb is understood more as a verbal communication, such as “to command or order” (cf. Jonker, 2013a:175; BDB, 619.4; NET, NIV), then we observe no instances of psychological insight into Solomon, thus creating an element of distance between the character and the reader. Many thanks to Dr. Pete Myers of Ethiopian Graduate School of Theology and Doug Smith of Columbia International University for their personal exchanges regarding this issue.

(Yamasaki, 2006:93). The word דרשׁ ('to seek') is a key term in Chronicles (cf. 5.2.2.1 and 5.4.3 above). The first two uses are in the negative evaluation of Saul in 1 Chr 10:13-14. Saul sought a medium and did not seek YHWH. The next use of דרשׁ occurs in 1 Chr 13:3. David acknowledges that he and the people did not seek the ark during the days of Saul. Japhet connects the *Hiphil* use of סבב in 1 Chr 10:14; 12:24(23); and 13:3 to how David is correcting Saul's errors in "seeking":

> Saul fails to *seek* the Lord and the ark, is found deserving of death for himself and his house, and so his kingdom is *turned over* to David. David has the kingdom *turned over* to him, 'turns' the ark to himself and Israel's worship, *seeks* the Lord as is right, and merits life for himself and his house (1993:276; emphasis original).

David seems to take ownership of the concept of "seeking YHWH" here. All eight of the following uses of דרשׁ in 1 Chronicles are either spoken by David or connected to him.[97] Its final use in this literary unit (2 Chr 1:5) is by the narrator and establishes that Solomon and the assembly of Israel are right to seek out the bronze altar (or YHWH; cf. n. 59 above).[98] The narrator will continue to use this key term throughout 2 Chr 10-36 as a means of evaluating the kings of Judah (along with comparing the kings to David himself; see 5.4.3 and 5.5.3). The ideology of seeking (YHWH) is thus associated with David and used by the narrator to align the reader's viewpoint with David's to see the importance of seeking YHWH just as David did.

Regarding the *informational* plane, as observed in 1 Chr 1-9, the amount of knowledge the reader brings to the text affects how much the reader is able to appreciate the (subtle) narrative choices the Chronicler makes. We limit our observations here to one example. In 1 Chr 10, the narrator writes seemingly for two audiences (the knowledgeable and unknowledgeable reader) yet masterfully makes his point known to both with the same text. Chronicles' second literary unit

---

[97] David speaks the next use of דרשׁ when he recognizes the error of not seeking YHWH regarding the moving of the ark (1 Chr 15:13). דרשׁ then appears in the song David instructs the Levites to sing (1 Chr 16:11; sourced by the Chronicler from Ps 105:4). David wants to seek (דרשׁ) YHWH after the sinful census but could not because of fear (1 Chr 21:30). David exhorts his son Solomon twice to seek (דרשׁ) YHWH (1 Chr 22:19; 28:8). The final use by David tells Solomon of the condition of blessing: if he seeks (דרשׁ) YHWH, YHWH will be found; if he abandons YHWH, YHWH will reject him (1 Chr 28:9). The other two uses of דרשׁ in 1 Chronicles are in 1 Chr 26:31 and 28:9. The search for mighty men in 26:31 is associated temporally with David's reign. The other use in 28:9 is again spoken by David and discusses how God searches all hearts and is David's reason that Solomon should know and serve YHWH.

[98] The rightness of this seeking is confirmed by YHWH's appearance to Solomon after Solomon prays and sacrifices there (1:7-12).

begins *in medias res*. Israel's army is in trouble. Even worse, the sons of Saul are quickly killed (1 Chr 10:2). If the reader is unaware of Saul's identity (other than his five mentions from 1 Chr 1-9 in which his identity as king is only intimated, not overtly stated), the reader simply sees the narrator zoom in on one man from Israel's army who has just lost his sons. This is a tragedy for any parent to experience. The proximity to Saul and his struggle with life and death with his armor-bearer over the following verses could very well endear the reader to Saul and his plight. The remaining verses of the story (through v. 12) withhold Saul's identity. The reader does not learn of Saul's kingship until v. 14, and even then, the narrator does not state it overtly. The reader may very well be able to understand that Saul's status or role is important (he has an armor-bearer, after all), but the unknowledgeable reader still does not know his history nor his identity as Israel's first king. The reader familiar with Saul from other sources knows of his prior transgressions and what is to come. First Chronicles 10:13-14 confirms what the knowledgeable reader already knew; this reader does not sympathize with Saul and sees clearly that this is a story of retribution to an unfaithful king. However, if a reader is unfamiliar with Saul, that reader perhaps sympathizes with Israel's first king as the story of Saul's death progresses. By holding off Saul's evaluation until the end of the story, the Chronicler has communicated retribution to the knowledgeable reader and sadness and sympathy to the unknowing reader. The overt evaluation in 1 Chr 10:13-14 then interprets the story and reverses any sympathy that may have developed in the audience, thus making the story all the more stark and powerful, taking the proximity to Saul and his armor-bearer and thrusting it away in disgust to perhaps a further distance than if the narrator had led with Saul's evaluation. By withholding Saul's kingship from the reader until the end of the story, the Chronicler ultimately creates distance between the reader and the fallen king (cf. Yamasaki, 2016:42).

### 5.5.3 – Perspective in 2 Chr 10-36

The narrator's point of view continues entirely in the third person in 2 Chr 10-36. There is a lot of dialogue throughout this literary unit, though far fewer instances of first-person verbs than in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9.[99] With so many more characters in 2 Chr 10-36 than in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 and the amount of dialogue, there are more shifts in perspective. This continues the tone observed in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 and the difference from 1 Chr 1-9. This section of Chronicles uses frequent perspective shifts. Which characters the reader should sympathize with is reinforced by these shifts.

The Chronicler uses *spatial* movement in 2 Chr 10-36 to reinforce the messages being discussed. The narrator gives a summation of King Asa's building projects and the lack of war in his reign in 2 Chr 14:5(6). The narrator then moves the reader close to Asa for an instance of

[99] There are approximately fifty-one occurrences of first-person verbs in 2 Chr 10-36 while there are over 100 in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9.

reported speech to his people (2 Chr 14:6[7]). Asa's speech repeats what the Chronicler has said in the previous verse but adds an explanation for the success–because Asa and the people have sought (דרשׁ; used twice) YHWH. Another example of *spatial* proximity is in the scene of Uzziah entering the temple. Even though Uzziah is the main character in this episode (the episode is about his sin and why he died a leper), the narrative shifts to the priests' perspective (Azariah and the eighty priests with him) in 2 Chr 26:17-18, and then again in 26:20, by making the priests the subject of the verbal clauses. The reader follows the priests' movement in v. 17 and sees their opposition to Uzziah in v. 18. The narrator positions the reader close to the priests with the verb פנה ('to turn'), so that when they look, "behold!" (הִנֵּה), there is leprosy on the king. The reader experiences the revelation of leprosy with the priests through the use of הִנֵּה. The king is distanced from the reader, which subtly reinforces that the king is in the wrong for entering the temple.

The use of הִנֵּה ('behold, look') in 2 Chr 26:20 exemplifies what we see elsewhere in 2 Chr 10-36. The narrator uses הִנֵּה more in 2 Chr 10-36 compared to the other literary units.[100] הִנֵּה is used for a variety of purposes in the HB/OT (Van der Merwe *et al.*, 2017:407-418), but we see multiple instances in 2 Chr 10-36 of the narrator using הִנֵּה to move the audience or other characters so they can see "the perspective of the observing character" (412). The other examples of the narrator using this method are in 2 Chr 13:14; 20:24; 23:13.

The *temporal* perspective of the Chronicler in 2 Chr 10-36 continues from a point in time after the exile. This is reinforced by the use of the phrase עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה ('until this day') in 2 Chr 10:19; 21:10 or עַד־הַיּוֹם ('until today') in 2 Chr 20:26; 35:25. As noted above in 5.2.3.2, the foreshadowing in 2 Chr 10:19 with this phrase informs the reader that the issue of the divided kingdom has not yet been resolved at the time of writing. One way the hopeful ending of Chronicles helps offset the discouraging note in 2 Chr 10:19 is with the use of temporal perspective. We have discussed the importance of 2 Chr 36:22-23 above in 5.3.3 *Plot Type*, but here we focus on the temporal indicators in 2 Chr 36:20-21. The use of עַד־מְלֹךְ מַלְכוּת פָּרָס ('until the reign of the

[100] הִנֵּה appears twice in 1 Chr 1-9 and fourteen times in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9. There are thirty-six occurrences of הִנֵּה in 2 Chr 10-36.

kingdom of Persia') in 2 Chr 36:20 places the reader after the end of the reign of the Babylonians and provides the reader a glimmer of hope in that the servitude to Babylon has ended. A similar hopeful message is detected in the verbal forms in 2 Chr 36:21. The twofold usage of the *qatal* form in עַד־רָצְתָה הָאָרֶץ ('until the land restored…') and כָּל־יְמֵי הָשַׁמָּה שָׁבָתָה ('all the days of the desolation it observed…') puts the fulfillment of the seventy years of Jeremiah's prophecy in the reader's past.[101] Those dark days are now over for God's people. The Chronicler then ends the book at 2 Chr 36:22-23 with a hopeful look to what may lie ahead.

The Chronicler continues in 2 Chr 10-36 to provide *psychological* insights into his characters. The narrator provides these insights for both major and minor characters like he does in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9, connecting his audience to his characters. The reader is told of Rehoboam's love for a certain wife (2 Chr 11:21) and Asa's love of soil (2 Chr 26:10). Characters' anger is also revealed by the narrator throughout the narrative, with YHWH's being discussed the most (e.g., Asa, 2 Chr 16:10; certain Ephraimites, 25:10; Uzziah, 26:19; YHWH, 25:15; 28:25; 33:6; 36:16). The narrator sometimes uses humans (typically prophets) to communicate YHWH's anger (2 Chr 28:9, 11, 13; 34:25). The narrator also reveals the characters' motivations (2 Chr 32:17-18; 32:31).

From the *phraseological* perspective, we examine how the narrator and another character refer to King Josiah in 2 Chr 34. The name "Josiah" (יֹאשִׁיָּהוּ) only appears twice in the thirty-three verses of 2 Chr 34 (in v. 1 and v. 33). The remainder of the named references to him is either "the king" (הַמֶּלֶךְ, twelve times by the narrator) or "the king of Judah" (מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה, two times by the prophetess Huldah on behalf of YHWH). The Chronicler is not reluctant to use the name "Josiah" elsewhere; the name "Josiah" appears thirteen times in 2 Chr 35. Why then does the Chronicler refer to Josiah so infrequently by his name in 2 Chr 34? We suggest that the repeated references to "the king" or "the king of Judah" rather than "Josiah" set up a contrast between the character of Josiah and the "kings of Judah" (מַלְכֵי יְהוּדָה) in 2 Chr 34:11 who are noted as having damaged the buildings of the temple (cf. 5.4.3 above). By using Josiah's name so infrequently, the Chronicler subtly puts the focus of the main character in this chapter on his status as "king" and specifically, as a "king of Judah", rather than the person "Josiah". This strengthens the contrast between the

[101] Note the two uses of מלא ('to fill, to fulfill') in 2 Chr 36:21. Cf. Klein (2012:544-545).

previous kings of Judah, who hurt the temple, and this king of Judah, who restores the temple and cares for YHWH's Torah.[102]

From the *ideological* perspective, we see concepts from King David in 1 Chr 28:9 repeated in 2 Chr 10-36. These repetitions create connections between the speakers (or narrator) and David and thus communicate for the audience how to evaluate both the speakers and the addressees. The end of 1 Chr 28:9 contains two conditional clauses. King David shares with Solomon that if Solomon seeks (דרשׁ) YHWH, YHWH will be found (מצא) by him. The other conditional warns that if Solomon abandons (עזב) YHWH, then YHWH will abandon (עזב) him. Seeking (either דרשׁ or בקשׁ) and finding (מצא) occur together three times in 2 Chr 10-36, all in 2 Chr 15. The first two uses in 15:2, 4 are spoken by Azariah (upon whom the Spirit of God has come), and the narrator uses the third in 15:15. The first use in 15:2 maintains the conditional nature of David's statement, but the second and third provide examples of the concept at work. These usages establish a connection to David's statement in 1 Chr 28:9 and further establish these events as positive in the eyes of the narrator (and thus intended to be positive for the reader as well). Similarly, David's negative conditional from 1 Chr 28:9 appears three times in 2 Chr 10-36 (2 Chr 12:5; 15:2; 24:20). In each case, the speaker is either identified as a prophet (Shemaiah in 2 Chr 12:5) or as speaking with the Spirit of God on him (Azariah in 2 Chr 15:2; Zechariah in 24:20). Each use again establishes a connection to David's statement and confirms the severity of the warning (2 Chr 15:2; repeated in the conditional form) or the statements (2 Chr 12:5; 24:20; showing the outworking of the conditional concept). That Asa and the people take the warning seriously following Azariah's speech renders a positive evaluation of them, while the actions of Rehoboam in 2 Chr 12 and Joash in 2 Chr 24 display a stark, negative contrast to David and the men speaking on behalf of God.

We see multiple examples of the Chronicler carefully managing what his characters and readers know on the *informational* plane in 2 Chr 10-36. We limit ourselves to comments on the reign of Rehoboam. The Chronicler introduces multiple unanswered questions in 2 Chr 10:2-3. The narrator explains that Jeroboam was in Egypt because he fled from Solomon (which was previously unknown to the reader). However, the narrator does not explain *why* Jeroboam fled to Egypt, nor how Jeroboam heard about Rehoboam being made king (10:1), nor why the grammatically ambiguous "they" call for Jeroboam (10:3). It is reasonable that the narrator supposes the audience knows of the story from 1 Kgs 11 (Klein, 2012:157). The narrator continues to introduce confusion

[102] The difference between Josiah and the negative "kings of Judah" here in 2 Chr 34 is further solidified by the use of the phrase תּוֹרַת־יְהוָה ('YHWH's law') in 34:14. See Jiang (2019:448-452, esp. 449).

to his reader when Jeroboam and all-Israel claim that Rehoboam's father hardened their yoke and neither Rehoboam, his older counselors, nor younger counselors seem to correct the statements of the people (appearing to contradict the narrator's comments in 2 Chr 2:16–17[17–18]; 8:7–10; cf. Klein, 2012:157-158; and 5.4.3). This creates distance between the reader and all characters involved (cf. Yamasaki, 2016:42), so the reader is not inclined to sympathize with any of them. These unresolved issues seem moot when Rehoboam answers the people harshly (2 Chr 10:13-14). The narrator then provides the audience with additional information in 2 Chr 10:15 that neither the characters nor the audience had known previously; Rehoboam's refusal to listen was prompted by God to fulfill his word to Jeroboam. Now the audience knows why things happened as they did, and the audience receives an (albeit indirect) answer as to why Jeroboam was called back from Egypt. The narrator provides further information to the audience in 2 Chr 10:19 when he says the kingdom of Israel continues in rebellion "to this day". The audience knows this for the remainder of Rehoboam's reign, but Rehoboam does not.

Now the reader knows more than the main character. This more informed position colors how the audience receives the rest of the story. When King Rehoboam tries to restore the kingdom (2 Chr 11:1), the reader knows it is for naught. When the audience sees Rehoboam building up cities in Judah (2 Chr 11:5-12), it can ultimately only be for defense and not regaining the northern kingdom. When members of the northern kingdom come back to the southern (2 Chr 11:13-17), the audience knows it can only be in part. The narrator's provision of information in 2 Chr 10:19 tempers any hope the reader may have of a reunited kingdom by the end of Rehoboam's reign or by the end of the book. The audience has this pall hanging over them for the rest of Chronicles. Perhaps then this is why the invitation by Cyrus in 2 Chr 36:22-23 feels all the more hopeful (cf. 5.3.3 *Plot Type* above); a great weight has finally been lifted.

## 5.6 – Results of Narrative Analysis

We have analyzed 1-2 Chronicles according to setting (5.2), plot (5.3), characterization (5.4), and perspective (5.5) to see how those frameworks function throughout the narrative. Now we summarize our results according to literary section (1 Chr 1-9; 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9; 2 Chr 10-36). This allows us to see how the narrative functions collectively in each of those sections and address the study's second primary investigation: how the rhetorical argument(s) and theme(s) of 2 Chr 10-36 compare to the uses of allusions to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36.

### 5.6.1 – 1 Chr 1-9

The first section of Chronicles, 1 Chr 1-9, opens at the *very* beginning of human history, implying the grand scope and scale of the narrative to follow. The narrative flows quickly through

numerous generations with various types of genealogical lists as its primary method of moving through time. The narrative slows enough to focus on specific places, including Israel's places of worship (which go by many names, indicating their continuity), Hebron, and Jerusalem. The plot flows by familial association rather than linear chronology, but the various plot points within the narrative reveal that the scope of the Chronicler's overall plot is indeed covered in this first literary unit of Chronicles. First Chronicles 1-9 is not an introduction to the narrative section that supposedly begins in 1 Chr 10. Rather, the narrative of Chronicles is contained in 1 Chr 1-9; what follows is a slowed-down and focused repetition of material that has already been discussed. The opening universality of Chronicles shows that the initial protagonist of the story is humanity itself, and humanity's goal is to return to be with God. The way that the genealogical lists proceed after 1 Chr 1 indicates that humanity's return to God will come through Israel, through the tribe of Judah in Israel, and through the line of David in Judah (cf. Wright, 1999:151).

The importance of the Levites and the places of worship where they serve indicate that while a son of David may lead the people (and thus humanity) in their return to God, the return to God's presence will be mediated through the protocols established for the worship of and connection to YHWH in the temple. The opponents in 1 Chr 1-9 indicate that the same characters can have God as both ally and opponent depending on their actions. Thus, the unfaithfulness of characters in Chronicles overrules any physical prowess or success they may enjoy. Faithfulness to Yahweh is demonstrated as more important.

The characterization in 1 Chr 1-9 is sparse, but the perspective and limited characterization of the literary unit point to how the reading can be significantly enhanced by the audience's own prior knowledge about the characters who appear in the narrative. The opening literary unit highlights the importance of: humanity at large and Israel's (both the person and the people group) place in humanity, God as the arbiter of blessing and judgment depending on people's adherence to his standards, David as one who prepares for the administration of Israel's place of worship, Solomon as temple-builder, the Levites as maintainers of the cult and worship complex, and foreign forces who operate at God's command. The perspective of 1 Chr 1-9 indicates a high-level (and thus distant) summary of the Chronicler's history from a post-exilic time frame.

### 5.6.2 – 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9

The setting of 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 is more focused than the opening unit, highlighting Gibeon, Israel's altars, Israel's places of worship (which are further shown to have continuity), and the importance of Jerusalem, over and above Hebron. The pacing of this unit concentrates on David's extensive preparation for the temple (and those involved in its administration) and then Solomon's building of the temple. Critical parts of the covenantal discussion in 1 Chr 17 are repeated multiple

times later in the unit, emphasizing the election of David's royal line and, more specifically, Solomon as the temple builder.

The plot of 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 fits into a more typical schema, especially with its escalation that includes the selection of the temple site and the temple preparations and with its peak when the temple is built. The plot in this section highlights the importance of prayer, the resolution of Israel having multiple cultic centers, and the kingdom's smooth transition from David to Solomon, underscoring Solomon's election by God. The opponents in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 show the necessity of meeting God's standards. Those who sin bring judgment on themselves and must repent and appeal to God's grace. We see further displays of retribution and conquest as well as the addition of a quest to move the ark and a test for Solomon (and future kings). The Chronicler uses plot twists to increase the tension and provide further incentive for the audience to connect with (or disconnect from) certain characters.

The characterization in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 places David and Solomon in the spotlight. King Saul begins this section as a man of unfaithfulness, providing a stark contrast to those who will immediately follow him on the throne. The people of Israel show strong support for both David and Solomon. God is active in the selection, support, and judging of these men as he guides his temple to completion. David is the ideal (though admittedly imperfect) king who seeks God and responds to God's correction. There are parallels established between David and Solomon, but the complexity of David's character is contrasted with the simplicity of his son's. Solomon fulfills his role as the temple builder, though the audience is not drawn as closely to Solomon. The Levites are a faithful group of servants of David and Solomon, God, and the temple itself. As in 1 Chr 1-9, the foreign forces present in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 are subservient to God and only succeed when God's people fail.

The narrative perspective of 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 continues in the third person from a post-exilic perspective, though this section contains vastly more dialogue than 1 Chr 1-9. The perspective shifts continually, though the focus is consistently on David, Solomon, YHWH, the Levites, and especially the temple and the final stages of its construction and dedication. The narrator brings the audience into the minds of many of the characters (both major and minor) and encourages a connection to those characters. The concept of "seeking YHWH" is tied to King David; "seeking YHWH" proves to be a central theme throughout the book (Jonker, 2015:427). This establishes another reason why King David is the human standard by which the kings in 2 Chr 10-36 are evaluated. The Chronicler's use of information, when and how much he allows the audience to have, offers the audience an enhanced engagement with the narrative, especially if the audience already knows of the Chronicler's stories and characters from elsewhere in the HB/OT.

### 5.6.3 – 2 Chr 10-36

The setting in 2 Chr 10-36 is broader than in 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9 but not as expansive as 1 Chr 1-9. Many locations are mentioned, but Jerusalem continues to serve as the main backdrop for the telling of the divided kingdom. The city serves as a place of safety and return for the kings and their people and the place where God's people come to seek him at his temple. Jerusalem has been chosen by God to be the place where he locates his name. How the kings of Judah interact with altars and the temple in 2 Chr 10-36 reveals their character and is one way the narrator evaluates them. When kings and people fail and Jerusalem becomes a place of idolatry and unfaithfulness instead of seeking God, the contrast between what God intends for his people and how they act becomes all the more striking. When Jerusalem is destroyed in Chronicles' final chapter, the wound of disappointment is bandaged by the hope provided by Cyrus's invitation to return to Jerusalem and restore the place where God and his people met. The movement of time in 2 Chr 10-36 is used by the Chronicler to accelerate and pause the narrative at moments of moral evaluation. The use of foreshadowing in this final literary unit anticipates both positive and negative outcomes, creating a compelling narrative that rewards the observant reader and encourages the audience to participate in its telling and take ownership of its messages.

The plot of 2 Chr 10-36 is, in one sense, a foregone conclusion. The opening unit of Chronicles has already informed the audience that Judah will prove unfaithful and be exiled. The question is not if the kings will ultimately fail, but how and when. This unit starts ominously with the kingdom dividing. The climactic point of 2 Chr 10-36 is Huldah's prophecy to Josiah: Josiah has done well and will not see destruction, but the damage done by previous kings is too great; the curses from the Torah will be enacted upon God's people and upon Jerusalem. The die has been cast. There is no going back. Josiah's reign ends with a king of Egypt speaking on behalf of God, and then the narrative quickly falls to the Babylonian exile. The plot of 2 Chr 10-36 is ultimately about how (un)faithful each king is to YHWH and his temple. As before, the Chronicler highlights in the plot that God can be both ally and opponent to the same characters, depending on their faithfulness to him and his standards. Characters' own sins impede their faithfulness throughout the narrative. This then leads to foreign forces continuing to act at the will of God based on the faithfulness or lack thereof from his people. The final chapters of this section see an unexpected twist in that some foreign kings knowingly act as God's agents. From an overall perspective, the plot of Chronicles does not fit cleanly into either category of comedy or tragedy. Instead, we understand the book to be "proleptic comedy", a tragedy that anticipates a hopeful future and comedic ending. The narrative engages its present reality in its Persian context but looks ahead to what may come. This literary unit is full of examples of retribution and conquest but also sees an example of vindication. God's people endure mockery and shame at the hands of the Assyrians, but

Judah's trust in YHWH is proven true by God's deliverance. More than the previous sections, the Chronicler uses elements of style such as irony, humor, and sarcasm to engage the wit of the reader and build a compelling climax to the story.

The characterization in 2 Chr 10-36 consistently focuses on evaluating the kings of Judah. David and Solomon are the human standards by which the kings are measured. All-Israel's faithfulness to YHWH is often seen as an indicator of the faithfulness of her king. Generally, the people of all-Israel are supportive of their king. Inclusion in all-Israel is open to more than just those of a particular geographical or genealogical birth, so the support of the king is not based on tribal biases. The kings themselves are evaluated by the Chronicler both overtly and implicitly, with their seeking of or unfaithfulness to YHWH as a primary barometer of their character. God is continuously active in 2 Chr 10-36, including acts of faithfulness to his promises. The Levites continue in their faithfulness to YHWH and the cultic duties assigned to them; sometimes, their obedience even outpaces that of the priests. The Levites and priests are demonstrated to be equals in 2 Chr 10-36.

The perspective in the Chronicler's final literary unit continues to be wholly third person from a post-exilic time frame with plenty of dialogue and changes in perspective. The Chronicler uses spatial movements in the narrative to create sympathy and respect for certain characters and places like the Levites and priests and the temple. Temporal perspective shifts are used by the Chronicler to change the tone of the narrative; one example is at the end of the book when retrospective language alleviates some of the heaviness of earlier foreshadowing. The Chronicler continues to allow the audience psychological insights into his characters, including God himself. This reaffirms a positive ethos for the narrator and further encourages the reader to trust him and his evaluations. The way the narrator and characters use names and titles, as in 2 Chr 34 with Josiah, the king of Judah, and how the narrator promotes the concepts of David, like seeking and finding YHWH versus abandoning YHWH, demonstrate that audience trust of the narrator is well placed. The narrator also uses information in ways similar to 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9, creating proximity or distance between the audience and his characters, subtly encouraging the audience to trust the Chronicler's evaluation of the narrative and its characters.

### 5.6.4 – Summary of Narrative Analysis

We have seen in Chronicles the importance of the Davidic kingship and how the people of Israel (especially "all-Israel") can relate to YHWH through the proper operation of the cult. The significance of the temple and its location in Jerusalem are paramount.[103] The kings following

[103] For additional studies highlighting the importance of Jerusalem in Chronicles, see Evans (2010:31 n. 2).

David succeed or fail (or both) based on how they relate to YHWH, the God of Israel. Schweitzer summarizes these ideas well through the lens of the Chronicler's genealogies:

> [T]he major themes of Chronicles are found in these lists and accompanying narrative asides—monarchy, cult, the identity of 'Israel' both internally and externally, retribution and blessing, 'seeking YHWH'—and in terms consistent with the idealism in the presentation of the narrative (2013:13-14).

These themes continue in the second literary unit of the book. The Davidic kingship is now front and center; many chapters are spent focusing on the robust preparations for the temple's construction and the development of its administration. David's success in relating to YHWH includes his ability to repent and correct his mistakes according to the Torah. Solomon is successful from the Chronicler's point of view because he seeks divine wisdom to lead God's people. God honors that request and provides for Solomon to build the "house of God". God's active participation "in both kingship and temple building" is seen throughout (Jonker 2010b:295). Balentine argues "for worship as the center of Israel's identity and mission… David and Solomon… centered the kingdom on the temple and its constant summons to seek God with wholehearted devotion" (1997:265).

The kings of the divided kingdom provide example after example of the importance of this connection to YHWH and his temple. Those who relate well to YHWH and care for his temple receive God's blessing. Those who spurn YHWH and disrupt or damage his temple receive his judgment. There are moments when certain kings shine in their leading of Israel to the presence of God. However, on the whole, the catalog of kings in 2 Chr 10-36 leads God's people in a downward spiral away from the presence of God in his Jerusalem temple, far away to the east in foreign exile. Just when all seems lost, the Chronicler gives voice to King Cyrus of Persia in an offer of hope to rebuild and replenish the destroyed temple, inviting God's people to relate to YHWH there once again. The centrality of the temple is not in its grandeur but in its emphasis on a relationship with the God who dwells there; it is in this worshipful relationship that all-Israel will find cohesion and unity:

> Postexilic Yehud as a conglomeration of clans is encouraged to find its national identity as a community gathered around the temple in Jerusalem. While the genealogies provide a common identity for the variety of family units that populate Yehud and provide a foundation for the inclusion of even more diverse family units, the focus on the temple cult as the appropriate application of immediate relational values offers an activity that would unite the family units. In this way, they are united in genealogical identity, divine

relationship, and cultic activity, all possible within the realities of an imperial social context (Boda, 2015:406).

## 5.7 – Comparison to Inner-Biblical Allusions to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36

We have analyzed the narrative of 1-2 Chronicles in 5.2 – 5.5 and summarized those findings in 5.6. Now we compare them to the results from Chapter 4, so we may answer the second primary question of the study: How does the Chronicler's use of Exodus impact his rhetorical argument(s) in the latter part of the narrative? Said another way, how does the Chronicler incorporate allusions to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36 into his rhetorical strategy? Do the purposes for these allusions align with the overall rhetorical emphases of the Chronicler, or are they ancillary to the text's main ideas?

We briefly review our findings from 4.3. The Chronicler uses sixeen allusions to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36 (plus fourteen recurrences throughout Chronicles, for a total of thirty alluding texts examined). Each of these allusions has one or more of the following uses: Moral Evaluation (both positive and negative), Elevate the Temple and Priesthood (through comparison to, or equation with, the tabernacle or by emphasizing the importance of the priesthood as shown in the Torah), Establish and Reaffirm a Standard or Truth (most often to evaluate some aspect of the narrative), Exegesis, and Encouragement.

The results of our narrative analysis coincide with at least three of the above uses of allusions to Exodus. Allusions used for moral evaluation certainly align with how the Chronicler spends much of 2 Chr 10-36 evaluating the kings of Judah by discussing their (un)faithfulness to YHWH and their adherence to the ways of David and Solomon before them. The elevation of the temple and priesthood through allusions to Exodus supports a significant theme throughout the narrative (including 2 Chr 10-36), the importance of the temple and the Levites (of which the priesthood is a part). This theme is seen in multiple ways: (1) the temple is equated to the tabernacle repeatedly and in many ways throughout Chronicles, and the Chronicler draws continuity between the Israelite cultic worship centers founded by Moses, David, and Solomon; (2) episodic descriptions of the Levites and priests at work (including establishing, defending, and restoring the temple); and (3) the sheer amount of the Chronicles narrative dedicated to Levitical family lines and their duties. The establishment or reaffirmation of standards and truth through allusions to Exodus reinforces both (1) the Chronicler's consistent presentation of God as one who interacts with his people based on established standards and (2) the moral evaluations that occur throughout Chronicles. Though the Chronicler frequently refers to the commands of Moses and God in the Torah and does provide exegesis on occasion, the Chronicler does not seem to exegete other HB/OT texts as a primary narrative goal. Likewise, there are elements of encouragement throughout Chronicles, not least of

which is how the book ends with hope amid Persian rule. These encouragements are directed both to the book's characters and to the audience, but, as with exegesis, it is difficult to argue that encouragement is a primary aim of the narrative overall or in 2 Chr 10-36.

In light of this comparison, we conclude that the Chronicler uses inner-biblical allusions to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36 to support his rhetorical aims both in 2 Chr 10-36 and throughout the book. The allusions' uses do not align in every way with the literary themes of Chronicles, but they do in large part. The Chronicler's allusions to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36 strengthen his moral evaluations, elevation of the temple and the Levites, and appeals to YHWH's standards, especially those from the Torah. We also conclude that studying the Chronicler's use of allusions to other HB/OT texts is a crucial step in the exegetical process to ascertain the Chronicler's purposes and themes for the narrative as a whole.

## 5.8 – Conclusion

This chapter investigated the text of 1-2 Chronicles using the narrative-analysis methodology outlined in 2.4 above. We examined the setting, plot, characterization, and perspective of Chronicles to determine its rhetorical arguments and themes in 1 Chr 1-9, 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9, 2 Chr 10-36, and overall. We then compared those results to the summative findings of Chapter 4. We found that the Chronicler uses allusions to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36 to support at least three of his rhetorical aims in that section of the narrative: to evaluate the moral characterization of his characters, to highlight and elevate the status of the temple and its attendants, the Levites, and to establish and reaffirm the standards by which the Chronicler evaluates his characters.

In the following chapter, we will conclude the study by summarizing the various findings from throughout the study and suggesting ways in which this research may impact biblical studies moving forward. We also suggest potential areas for further study.

# Chapter 6 – Conclusion

## 6.1 – Summary and Impact

This study sought to answer these principal questions: Where, how, and for what purpose(s) does the Chronicler reference the book of Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36? How does the Chronicler's use of Exodus impact his rhetorical argument(s) in that part of the narrative? A review of the relevant literature revealed that while some individual allusions to Exodus had been considered by others discussing 2 Chr 10-36, no systematic consideration of such allusions had yet been published. A review of intertextuality and allusion studies in the realm of biblical studies revealed that no consensus has (yet?) been reached on how to analyze inner-biblical allusions. To answer the first principal question above, this study promoted an adaptation of the methodology proposed by Kynes (2012) because of its robust stature and movement back and forth between synchronic and diachronic considerations. To answer the second principal question above, this study also promoted the narrative analysis methods of Lubeck (2001) and perspective criticism (especially Yamasaki, 2006; 2016).

After establishing our methodologies, we identified the Chronicler's allusions in 2 Chr 10-36 to the book of Exodus, assessed the nature of those allusions, and evaluated the rhetorical argument(s) motivating the allusions. We began by discussing the multiple ways the allusions were discovered and how we evaluated the *Date* step for the allusions. We reviewed different types of false positives discovered in the research. We then investigated each identified allusive passage and any recurrences using our methodology: 2 Chr 10:4-16; 16:14; 19:10; 20:3-29; 21:14; 22:11; 24:6-12; 26:16-21 (two distinct allusions to Exodus are in this passage); 27:2; 28:19; 29:31; 30:6-9; 32:21; 34:4-7; 35:13. Along with the evoked texts from Exodus, the Chronicler co-evokes texts from Numbers, Deuteronomy, or Nehemiah in five instances. We observed that the Chronicler uses an assortment of lexical, conceptual, and structural markers to indicate his allusions to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36, though shared language is the primary method. The Dating and Coherence steps in our methodology consistently demonstrated that Exodus is the evoked text (along with its co-evoked texts) and that Chronicles is the alluding text. Each of the thirty allusions to Exodus (sixteen allusions plus fourteen recurrences) has one or more of the following uses (in descending order of frequency): Moral Evaluation, Elevate the Temple and Priesthood, Establish and Reaffirm a Standard or Truth, Exegesis, and Encouragement. The Reciprocations observed were in one of three general categories: emphasis on longevity, that unfaithfulness may arise from within Israel, and positive and negative examples. The Historical Implications comprised six categories: a high regard for pentateuchal and other HB/OT texts and their topics; the Chronicler applies texts to his

audience; the Chronicler's exegesis; a willingness by the Chronicler to evaluate well-known persons negatively; the Chronicler presents an ideal; and the well-known status of certain stories. We thus answered the first principal question above.

We then situated the allusions evaluated in this study in their narrative context for rhetorical investigation and comparison. We examined the setting, plot, characterization, and perspective of Chronicles to determine its rhetorical arguments and themes in 1 Chr 1-9, 1 Chr 10 – 2 Chr 9, 2 Chr 10-36, and overall. We observed in Chronicles the importance of the Davidic kingship and how the people of Israel (especially "all-Israel") can relate to YHWH through the proper operation of the cult. The significance of the temple and its location in Jerusalem are paramount. The centrality of the temple is not in its grandeur but in its emphasis on a relationship with the God who dwells there. The kings following David succeed or fail (or both) based on how they relate to YHWH, the God of Israel. Those who relate well to YHWH and care for his temple receive God's blessing. Those who spurn YHWH and disrupt or damage his temple receive his judgment. Ultimately, the kings in 2 Chr 10-36 lead God's people in a downward spiral away from the presence of God in his Jerusalem temple and toward foreign exile. The book ends with an offer of hope from the King of Persia to rebuild and replenish the destroyed temple, inviting God's people to relate to YHWH there once again. Our study then compared these summative findings to the earlier results of study and found that the Chronicler uses allusions to Exodus in 2 Chr 10-36 to support at least three of his rhetorical aims in that section of the narrative: (1) to evaluate the moral characterization of his characters, (2) to highlight and elevate the status of the temple and its attendants, the Levites, and (3) to establish and reaffirm the standards by which the Chronicler evaluates his characters. This section of the study answered the second principal question above.

To our knowledge, a systematic examination of the Chronicler's allusions to the book of Exodus or any pentateuchal book has not been published. This study paves the way for such a publication. Additionally, this study has revealed exegetical insights at specific points in 2 Chr 10-36 (including allusions not previously noted in the scholarship reviewed; see, e.g., 3.2.2) and insight into the Chronicler's overall rhetorical arguments, his rhetorical arguments in 2 Chr 10-36, and his view of Exodus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. This study has reaffirmed the value of studies of a larger biblical text's allusions like Sommer (1998); Boda & Floyd (2003); Pyeon (2003); Stead (2009); Scheetz (2012); Lee (2015); and Gibson (2016) before it. This study has also reaffirmed the value of examining a larger text's connection to one particular source like Vassar (2007); Lyons (2009); Kynes (2012); and Lester (2015). However, the combination of three elements set this study apart from previous studies of inner-biblical allusion in the HB/OT: (1) a systematic approach to finding inner-biblical allusions to one particular source, (2) a subsequent evaluation of those

allusions with a robust (adapted) methodology like that of Kynes (2012), and (3) a comparison of those allusions' rhetorical uses to a narrative analysis of the alluding text. By analyzing inner-biblical allusions across more extensive portions of the HB/OT in this way, we can evaluate more fully how this literary technique fits into authors' rhetorical arguments and perceive more clearly authors' writing patterns, emphases, and themes.

## 6.2 – Areas for Further Study

This study of the Chronicler's allusions (in 2 Chr 10-36) to Exodus has provided a starting point for other Chronicles studies like it. This study could lead to broader discussions of the Chronicler's use of Exodus throughout the entirety of Chronicles, not just the telling of the divided kingdom. Likewise, this study has shown the efficacy of studying allusions in 2 Chr 10-36 and could prompt studies of how the Chronicler uses and views other texts in the Pentateuch, individual pentateuchal books, the Pentateuch as a whole, or other books in the HB/OT; such studies could focus on allusions in 2 Chr 10-36 or the entire narrative.

Another area ripe for discussion in light of the present study would be comparing allusive uses in Chronicles and biblical books closely associated with it, namely 1-2 Samuel, 1-2 Kings, Ezra, and Nehemiah. A comparison of how the Chronicler's sources of Samuel and Kings use allusions to Exodus (or the Pentateuch or other HB/OT books) versus how the Chronicler himself uses similar allusions could provide new understandings for each book, not just on an exegetical level for those passages concerned but also regarding their rhetorical emphases at large. A comparison of how the texts of Ezra and Nehemiah use allusions versus how Chronicles does could not only bring out exegetical and rhetorical insights but could also provide further data for the matter of the authorship of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah by comparing the nature of their respective allusions.

# Appendix A:

# Differences between 1 Kgs 12:1-24 and 2 Chr 10:1-11:4

The below table presents textual differences between 1 Kgs 12:1-24 and 2 Chr 10:1-11:4.[1]

= Lexical difference (omission/addition)

= Spelling difference

= Word order difference

| 2 Chr 10 | 1 Kings 12 |
|---|---|
| 1 וַיֵּלֶךְ רְחַבְעָם שְׁכֶמָה כִּי שְׁכֶם בָּאוּ כָל־יִשְׂרָאֵל לְהַמְלִיךְ אֹתוֹ: | 1 וַיֵּלֶךְ רְחַבְעָם שְׁכֶם כִּי שְׁכֶם בָּא כָל־יִשְׂרָאֵל לְהַמְלִיךְ אֹתוֹ: |
| 2 וַיְהִי כִּשְׁמֹעַ יָרָבְעָם בֶּן־נְבָט וְהוּא בְּמִצְרַיִם אֲשֶׁר בָּרַח מִפְּנֵי שְׁלֹמֹה הַמֶּלֶךְ וַיֵּשֶׁב יָרָבְעָם מִמִּצְרָיִם: | 2 וַיְהִי כִּשְׁמֹעַ יָרָבְעָם בֶּן־נְבָט וְהוּא עוֹדֶנּוּ בְּמִצְרַיִם אֲשֶׁר בָּרַח מִפְּנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ שְׁלֹמֹה וַיֵּשֶׁב יָרָבְעָם בְּמִצְרָיִם: |
| 3 וַיִּשְׁלְחוּ וַיִּקְרְאוּ־לוֹ וַיָּבֹא יָרָבְעָם וְכָל־יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיְדַבְּרוּ אֶל־רְחַבְעָם לֵאמֹר: | 3 וַיִּשְׁלְחוּ וַיִּקְרְאוּ־לוֹ וַיָּבֹאוּ יָרָבְעָם וְכָל־קְהַל יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיְדַבְּרוּ אֶל־רְחַבְעָם לֵאמֹר: |
| 4 אָבִיךָ הִקְשָׁה אֶת־עֻלֵּנוּ וְעַתָּה הָקֵל מֵעֲבֹדַת אָבִיךָ הַקָּשָׁה וּמֵעֻלּוֹ הַכָּבֵד אֲשֶׁר־נָתַן עָלֵינוּ וְנַעַבְדֶךָּ: | 4 אָבִיךָ הִקְשָׁה אֶת־עֻלֵּנוּ וְאַתָּה עַתָּה הָקֵל מֵעֲבֹדַת אָבִיךָ הַקָּשָׁה וּמֵעֻלּוֹ הַכָּבֵד אֲשֶׁר־נָתַן עָלֵינוּ וְנַעַבְדֶךָּ: |
| 5 וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם עוֹד שְׁלֹשֶׁת יָמִים וְשׁוּבוּ אֵלָי וַיֵּלֶךְ הָעָם: ס | 5 וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵיהֶם לְכוּ עַד שְׁלֹשֶׁת יָמִים וְשׁוּבוּ אֵלָי וַיֵּלְכוּ הָעָם: |
| 6 וַיִּוָּעַץ הַמֶּלֶךְ רְחַבְעָם אֶת־הַזְּקֵנִים אֲשֶׁר־הָיוּ עֹמְדִים לִפְנֵי שְׁלֹמֹה אָבִיו בִּהְיֹתוֹ חַי לֵאמֹר אֵיךְ אַתֶּם נוֹעָצִים לְהָשִׁיב לָעָם־הַזֶּה דָּבָר: | 6 וַיִּוָּעַץ הַמֶּלֶךְ רְחַבְעָם אֶת־הַזְּקֵנִים אֲשֶׁר־הָיוּ עֹמְדִים אֶת־פְּנֵי שְׁלֹמֹה אָבִיו בִּהְיֹתוֹ חַי לֵאמֹר אֵיךְ אַתֶּם נוֹעָצִים לְהָשִׁיב אֶת־הָעָם־הַזֶּה דָּבָר: |
| 7 וַיְדַבְּרוּ אֵלָיו לֵאמֹר אִם־תִּהְיֶה לְטוֹב לָעָם הַזֶּה וּרְצִיתָם וְדִבַּרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם דְּבָרִים טוֹבִים וְהָיוּ לְךָ עֲבָדִים כָּל־הַיָּמִים: | 7 וַיְדַבֵּר אֵלָיו לֵאמֹר אִם־הַיּוֹם תִּהְיֶה־עֶבֶד לָעָם הַזֶּה וַעֲבַדְתָּם וַעֲנִיתָם וְדִבַּרְתָּ אֲלֵיהֶם דְּבָרִים טוֹבִים וְהָיוּ לְךָ עֲבָדִים כָּל־הַיָּמִים: |
| 8 וַיַּעֲזֹב אֶת־עֲצַת הַזְּקֵנִים אֲשֶׁר יְעָצֻהוּ וַיִּוָּעַץ אֶת־הַיְלָדִים אֲשֶׁר גָּדְלוּ אִתּוֹ הָעֹמְדִים לְפָנָיו: | 8 וַיַּעֲזֹב אֶת־עֲצַת הַזְּקֵנִים אֲשֶׁר יְעָצֻהוּ וַיִּוָּעַץ אֶת־הַיְלָדִים אֲשֶׁר גָּדְלוּ אִתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר הָעֹמְדִים לְפָנָיו: |

[1] The text is taken from the Codex Leningradensis Hebrew Text from Bibleworks 10.

| 2 Chr 10 | 1 Kings 12 |
| --- | --- |
| 9 וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם מָה אַתֶּם נוֹעָצִים וְנָשִׁיב דָּבָר אֶת־הָעָם הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר דִּבְּרוּ אֵלַי לֵאמֹר הָקֵל מִן־הָעֹל אֲשֶׁר־נָתַן אָבִיךָ עָלֵינוּ: | 9 וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵיהֶם מָה אַתֶּם נוֹעָצִים וְנָשִׁיב דָּבָר אֶת־הָעָם הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר דִּבְּרוּ אֵלַי לֵאמֹר הָקֵל מִן־הָעֹל אֲשֶׁר־נָתַן אָבִיךָ עָלֵינוּ: |
| 10 וַיְדַבְּרוּ אִתּוֹ הַיְלָדִים אֲשֶׁר גָּדְלוּ אִתּוֹ לֵאמֹר כֹּה־תֹאמַר לָעָם אֲשֶׁר־דִּבְּרוּ אֵלֶיךָ לֵאמֹר אָבִיךָ הִכְבִּיד אֶת־עֻלֵּנוּ וְאַתָּה הָקֶל מֵעָלֵינוּ כֹּה תֹאמַר אֲלֵהֶם קָטָנִּי עָבָה מִמָּתְנֵי אָבִי: | 10 וַיְדַבְּרוּ אִתּוֹ הַיְלָדִים אֲשֶׁר גָּדְלוּ אִתּוֹ לֵאמֹר כֹּה־תֹאמַר לָעָם הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר דִּבְּרוּ אֵלֶיךָ לֵאמֹר אָבִיךָ הִכְבִּיד אֶת־עֻלֵּנוּ וְאַתָּה הָקֶל מֵעָלֵינוּ כֹּה תְדַבֵּר אֲלֵיהֶם קָטָנִּי עָבָה מִמָּתְנֵי אָבִי: |
| 11 וְעַתָּה אָבִי הֶעְמִיס עֲלֵיכֶם עֹל כָּבֵד וַאֲנִי אוֹסִיף עַל־עֻלְּכֶם אָבִי יִסַּר אֶתְכֶם בַּשּׁוֹטִים וַאֲנִי בָּעַקְרַבִּים: ס | 11 וְעַתָּה אָבִי הֶעְמִיס עֲלֵיכֶם עֹל כָּבֵד וַאֲנִי אוֹסִיף עַל־עֻלְּכֶם אָבִי יִסַּר אֶתְכֶם בַּשּׁוֹטִים וַאֲנִי אֲיַסֵּר אֶתְכֶם בָּעַקְרַבִּים: |
| 12 וַיָּבֹא יָרָבְעָם וְכָל־הָעָם אֶל־רְחַבְעָם בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִשִׁי כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר הַמֶּלֶךְ לֵאמֹר שׁוּבוּ אֵלַי בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִשִׁי: | 12 וַיָּבֹא יָרָבְעָם וְכָל־הָעָם אֶל־רְחַבְעָם בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִשִׁי כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר הַמֶּלֶךְ לֵאמֹר שׁוּבוּ אֵלַי בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִשִׁי: |
| 13 וַיַּעֲנֵם הַמֶּלֶךְ קָשָׁה וַיַּעֲזֹב הַמֶּלֶךְ רְחַבְעָם אֶת עֲצַת הַזְּקֵנִים: | 13 וַיַּעַן הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶת־הָעָם קָשָׁה וַיַּעֲזָב אֶת־עֲצַת הַזְּקֵנִים אֲשֶׁר יְעָצֻהוּ: |
| 14 וַיְדַבֵּר אֲלֵהֶם כַּעֲצַת הַיְלָדִים לֵאמֹר אָבִי הִכְבִּיד אֶת־עֻלְּכֶם וַאֲנִי אוֹסִיף עָלָיו אָבִי יִסַּר אֶתְכֶם בַּשּׁוֹטִים וַאֲנִי בָּעַקְרַבִּים: | 14 וַיְדַבֵּר אֲלֵיהֶם כַּעֲצַת הַיְלָדִים לֵאמֹר אָבִי הִכְבִּיד אֶת־עֻלְּכֶם וַאֲנִי אוֹסִיף עַל־עֻלְּכֶם אָבִי יִסַּר אֶתְכֶם בַּשּׁוֹטִים וַאֲנִי אֲיַסֵּר אֶתְכֶם בָּעַקְרַבִּים: |
| 15 וְלֹא־שָׁמַע הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶל־הָעָם כִּי־הָיְתָה נִסָּבָה מֵעִם הָאֱלֹהִים לְמַעַן הָקִים יְהוָה אֶת־דְּבָרוֹ אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר בְּיַד אֲחִיָּהוּ הַשִּׁלוֹנִי אֶל־יָרָבְעָם בֶּן־נְבָט: | 15 וְלֹא־שָׁמַע הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶל־הָעָם כִּי־הָיְתָה סִבָּה מֵעִם יְהוָה לְמַעַן הָקִים אֶת־דְּבָרוֹ אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה בְּיַד אֲחִיָּה הַשִּׁילֹנִי אֶל־יָרָבְעָם בֶּן־נְבָט: |
| 16 וְכָל־יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי לֹא־שָׁמַע הַמֶּלֶךְ לָהֶם וַיָּשִׁיבוּ הָעָם אֶת־הַמֶּלֶךְ לֵאמֹר מַה־לָּנוּ חֵלֶק בְּדָוִד וְלֹא־נַחֲלָה בְּבֶן־יִשַׁי אִישׁ לְאָהָלֶיךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל עַתָּה רְאֵה בֵיתְךָ דָּוִיד וַיֵּלֶךְ כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל לְאָהָלָיו: ס | 16 וַיַּרְא כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי לֹא־שָׁמַע הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲלֵיהֶם וַיָּשִׁבוּ הָעָם אֶת־הַמֶּלֶךְ דָּבָר לֵאמֹר מַה־לָּנוּ חֵלֶק בְּדָוִד וְלֹא־נַחֲלָה בְּבֶן־יִשַׁי לְאָהָלֶיךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל עַתָּה רְאֵה בֵיתְךָ דָּוִד וַיֵּלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל לְאָהָלָיו: |
| 17 וּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הַיֹּשְׁבִים בְּעָרֵי יְהוּדָה וַיִּמְלֹךְ עֲלֵיהֶם רְחַבְעָם: | 17 וּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הַיֹּשְׁבִים בְּעָרֵי יְהוּדָה וַיִּמְלֹךְ עֲלֵיהֶם רְחַבְעָם: פ |

| 2 Chr 10 | 1 Kings 12 |
|---|---|
| 18 וַיִּשְׁלַ֨ח הַמֶּ֜לֶךְ רְחַבְעָ֗ם אֶת־הַדֹּרֹם֙ אֲשֶׁ֣ר עַל־הַמַּ֔ס וַיִּרְגְּמ֥וּ־בָ֛ו בְּנֵ֥י־יִשְׂרָאֵ֖ל אֶ֣בֶן וַיָּ֑מָת וְהַמֶּ֜לֶךְ רְחַבְעָ֗ם הִתְאַמֵּץ֙ לַעֲל֣וֹת בַּמֶּרְכָּבָ֔ה לָנ֖וּס יְרוּשָׁלִָֽם׃ ס | 18 וַיִּשְׁלַ֨ח הַמֶּ֜לֶךְ רְחַבְעָ֗ם אֶת־אֲדֹרָם֙ אֲשֶׁ֣ר עַל־הַמַּ֔ס וַיִּרְגְּמ֥וּ כָל־יִשְׂרָאֵ֖ל בֶּ֣ן אֶ֣בֶן וַיָּ֑מָת וְהַמֶּ֜לֶךְ רְחַבְעָ֗ם הִתְאַמֵּץ֙ לַעֲל֣וֹת בַּמֶּרְכָּבָ֔ה לָנ֖וּס יְרוּשָׁלִָֽם׃ |
| 19 וַיִּפְשְׁע֥וּ יִשְׂרָאֵ֖ל בְּבֵ֣ית דָּוִ֑יד עַ֖ד הַיּ֥וֹם הַזֶּֽה׃ ס | 19 וַיִּפְשְׁע֥וּ יִשְׂרָאֵ֖ל בְּבֵ֣ית דָּוִ֑יד עַ֖ד הַיּ֥וֹם הַזֶּֽה׃ ס |
| Omitted in 2 Chronicles | 20 וַיְהִ֗י כִּשְׁמֹ֤עַ כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל֙ כִּי־שָׁ֣ב יָרָבְעָ֔ם וַיִּשְׁלְח֥וּ וַיִּקְרְא֖וּ אֹת֑וֹ אֶל־הָעֵדָ֗ה וַיַּמְלִיכ֤וּ אֹתוֹ֙ עַל־כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל לֹ֥א הָיָ֖ה אַחֲרֵ֣י בֵית־דָּוִ֑ד זוּלָתִ֖י שֵׁ֥בֶט־יְהוּדָ֖ה לְבַדּֽוֹ׃ |
| | 2 Chr 11 |
| 1 וַיָּבֹ֣א רְחַבְעָ֗ם יְרוּשָׁלַ֙͏ִם֙ וַיַּקְהֵ֣ל אֶת־בֵּ֣ית יְהוּדָ֔ה וּבִנְיָמִ֕ן מֵאָ֥ה וּשְׁמוֹנִ֖ים אֶ֣לֶף בָּח֑וּר עֹשֵׂ֥ה מִלְחָמָ֖ה לְהִלָּחֵ֥ם עִם־יִשְׂרָאֵ֛ל לְהָשִׁ֥יב אֶת־הַמַּמְלָכָ֖ה לִרְחַבְעָֽם׃ פ | 21 וַיָּבֹ֣א רְחַבְעָ֗ם יְרוּשָׁלַ֙͏ִם֙ וַיַּקְהֵ֣ל אֶת־כָּל־בֵּ֣ית יְהוּדָ֔ה וְאֶת־שֵׁ֥בֶט בִּנְיָמִ֖ן מֵאָ֣ה וּשְׁמוֹנִ֑ים אֶ֣לֶף בָּח֗וּר עֹשֵׂ֤ה מִלְחָמָה֙ לְהִלָּחֵ֣ם עִם־בֵּ֔ית יִשְׂרָאֵ֖ל לְהָשִׁ֥יב אֶת־הַמְּלוּכָ֖ה לִרְחַבְעָ֥ם בֶּן־שְׁלֹמֹֽה׃ פ |
| 2 וַיְהִ֥י דְבַר־יְהוָ֖ה אֶל־שְׁמַעְיָ֥הוּ אִישׁ־הָאֱלֹהִ֖ים לֵאמֹֽר׃ | 22 וַיְהִ֥י דְבַר הָאֱלֹהִ֖ים אֶל־שְׁמַעְיָ֥ה אִישׁ־הָאֱלֹהִ֖ים לֵאמֹֽר׃ |
| 3 אֱמֹ֞ר אֶל־רְחַבְעָ֣ם בֶּן־שְׁלֹמֹ֗ה מֶ֚לֶךְ יְהוּדָ֔ה וְאֶל֙ כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל בִּ֖יהוּדָה וּבִנְיָמִ֑ן לֵאמֹֽר׃ | 23 אֱמֹ֞ר אֶל־רְחַבְעָ֣ם בֶּן־שְׁלֹמֹ֗ה מֶ֚לֶךְ יְהוּדָ֔ה וְאֶל־כָּל־בֵּ֖ית יְהוּדָ֣ה וּבִנְיָמִ֑ין וְיֶ֥תֶר הָעָ֖ם לֵאמֹֽר׃ |
| 4 כֹּ֣ה אָמַ֔ר יְהוָ֖ה לֹא־תַעֲל֣וּ וְלֹא־תִלָּחֲמ֗וּ עִם־אֲחֵיכֶם֙ שׁ֣וּבוּ אִ֣ישׁ לְבֵית֔וֹ כִּ֥י מֵאִתִּ֖י נִהְיָ֣ה הַדָּבָ֣ר הַזֶּ֑ה וַיִּשְׁמְע֗וּ אֶת־דִּבְרֵ֙י֙ יְהוָ֔ה וַיָּשֻׁ֖בוּ מִלֶּ֥כֶת אֶל־יָרָבְעָֽם׃ פ | 24 כֹּ֣ה אָמַ֔ר יְהוָ֖ה לֹא־תַעֲל֣וּ וְלֹא־תִלָּחֲמ֗וּ עִם־אֲחֵיכֶם֙ בְּנֵ֣י־יִשְׂרָאֵ֔ל שׁ֣וּבוּ אִ֣ישׁ לְבֵית֔וֹ כִּ֥י מֵאִתִּ֖י נִהְיָ֣ה הַדָּבָ֣ר הַזֶּ֑ה וַיִּשְׁמְע֗וּ אֶת־דִּבְרֵ֙י֙ יְהוָ֔ה וַיָּשֻׁ֖בוּ לָלֶ֥כֶת כִּדְבַ֖ר יְהוָֽה׃ ס |

# Appendix B: Examined Alluding Texts

## B.1 – Examined Alluding Texts, Their Recurrences, and Evoked Texts, Ordered by Section

| Section | 2 Chronicles Text | Recurrence(s) | Primary Evoked Text(s) | Secondary Evoked Text(s) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3.2.1 | 10:4-16 | 2 Chr 25:16-20; 35:22 | Exod 1:14; 6:9 | Exod 1:11, 13; 2:23; 5:9, 11, 18; 6:5-6; 7:4, 13, 16, 22; 8:11(15), 15(19); 9:12; 11:9 |
| 3.2.2 | 16:14 | 1 Chr 9:30 | Exod 30:25 | - |
| 3.2.3 | 19:10 | 2 Chr 17:7-9 | Exod 18:20 | - |
| 3.2.4 | 20:3-29 | - | Exod 14:13 | Exod 14:10, 14, 25 |
| 3.2.5 | 21:14 | 1 Chr 21:17 | Exod 9:14 | Exod 7:27(8:2); 12:13, 23, 27 |
| 3.2.6 | 22:11 | - | Exod 2:7 | Exod 2:4-5, 8-10 |
| 3.2.7 | 24:6-12 | 1 Chr 29:7; 2 Chr 34:8-14 | Exod 30:11-16 | - |
| 3.2.8a | 26:16-21 | 1 Chr 6:34(49); 2 Chr 2:2-3(3-4); 13:11; 29:7 | Exod 30:7-8; Num 17:5(16:40) | Exod 40:26-27 |
| 3.2.8b | 26:19-20 | - | Exod 28:36-38 | - |
| 3.2.9 | 27:2 | - | Exod 32:7; Deut 9:12 | - |
| 3.2.10 | 28:19 | - | Exod 32:25 | - |
| 3.2.11 | 29:31 | - | Exod 35:5, 22 | - |
| 3.2.12 | 30:6-9 | 2 Chr 29:10; 36:13 | Exod 32:8-13; Neh 9:16-19, 26-32 | - |
| 3.2.13 | 32:21 | - | Exod 23:20-23 | - |
| 3.2.14 | 34:4-7 | 2 Chr 15:16 | Exod 32:20; Deut 9:21 | - |
| 3.2.15 | 35:13 | - | Exod 12:9-11; Deut 16:7 | - |

## B.2 – Examined Alluding Texts (including Recurrences) and Evoked Texts, Ordered by Location in Chronicles

| Section | Alluding Text[1] | Exodus Primary Evoked Text | Exodus Secondary Evoked Text | Co-Evoked Text |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3.2.8a | 1 Chr 6:34(49)* | 30:7-8 | Exod 40:26-27 | Num 17:5(16:40) |
| 3.2.2 | 1 Chr 9:30* | 30:25 | - | - |
| 3.2.5 | 1 Chr 21:17* | 9:14 | Various[2] | - |
| 3.2.7 | 1 Chr 29:7* | 30:11-16 | - | - |
| 3.2.8a | 2 Chr 2:2-3(3-4)* | 30:7-8 | Exod 40:26-27 | Num 17:5(16:40) |
| 3.2.1 | 2 Chr 10:4-16 | 1:14; 6:9 | Various[3] | - |
| 3.2.8a | 2 Chr 13:11* | 30:7-8 | Exod 40:26-27 | Num 17:5(16:40) |
| 3.2.14 | 2 Chr 15:16* | 32:20 | - | Deut 9:21 |
| 3.2.2 | 2 Chr 16:14 | 30:25 | - | - |
| 3.2.3 | 2 Chr 17:7-9* | 18:20 | - | - |
| 3.2.3 | 2 Chr 19:10 | 18:20 | - | - |
| 3.2.4 | 2 Chr 20:3-29 | 14:13 | Exod 14:10, 14, 25 | - |
| 3.2.5 | 2 Chr 21:14 | 9:14 | Various[2] | - |
| 3.2.6 | 2 Chr 22:11 | 2:7 | Exod 2:4-5, 8-10 | - |
| 3.2.7 | 2 Chr 24:6-12 | 30:11-16 | - | - |
| 3.2.1 | 2 Chr 25:16-20* | - | Various[3] | - |
| 3.2.8a | 2 Chr 26:16-21 | 30:7-8 | Exod 40:26-27 | Num 17:5(16:40) |
| 3.2.8b | 2 Chr 26:19-20 | 28:36-38 | - | - |
| 3.2.9 | 2 Chr 27:2 | 32:7 | - | Deut 9:12 |
| 3.2.10 | 2 Chr 28:19 | 32:25 | - | - |
| 3.2.8a | 2 Chr 29:7* | 30:7-8 | Exod 40:26-27 | Num 17:5(16:40) |
| 3.2.12 | 2 Chr 29:10* | 32:8-13 | - | Neh 9:16-19, 26-32 |
| 3.2.11 | 2 Chr 29:31 | 35:5, 22 | - | - |
| 3.2.12 | 2 Chr 30:6-9 | 32:8-13 | - | Neh 9:16-19, 26-32 |
| 3.2.13 | 2 Chr 32:21 | 23:20-23 | - | - |
| 3.2.14 | 2 Chr 34:4-7 | 32:20 | - | Deut 9:21 |
| 3.2.7 | 2 Chr 34:8-14* | 30:11-16 | - | - |
| 3.2.15 | 2 Chr 35:13 | 12:9-11 | - | Deut 16:7 |
| 3.2.1 | 2 Chr 35:22* | - | Various[3] | - |
| 3.2.12 | 2 Chr 36:13* | 32:8-13 | - | Neh 9:16-19, 26-32 |

[1] The texts marked with an asterisk (*) are examined in the study as a recurrence.

[2] Exod 7:27(8:2); 12:13, 23, 27.

[3] Exod 1:11-13; 2:23; 5:9, 11, 18; 6:5-6; 7:4, 13, 16, 22; 8:11(15), 15(19); 9:12; 11:9.

## B.3 – Examined Alluding Texts (including Recurrences) and Evoked Texts, Ordered by Location in Exodus

| Section | Alluding Text[1] | Exodus Primary Evoked Text | Exodus Secondary Evoked Text | Co-Evoked Text |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3.2.1 | 2 Chr 25:16-20* | - | Various[2] | - |
| 3.2.1 | 2 Chr 35:22* | - | Various[2] | - |
| 3.2.1 | 2 Chr 10:4-16 | 1:14; 6:9 | Various[2] | - |
| 3.2.6 | 2 Chr 22:11 | 2:7 | Exod 2:4-5, 8-10 | - |
| 3.2.5 | 1 Chr 21:17* | 9:14 | Various[3] | - |
| 3.2.5 | 2 Chr 21:14 | 9:14 | Various[3] | - |
| 3.2.15 | 2 Chr 35:13 | 12:9-11 | - | Deut 16:7 |
| 3.2.4 | 2 Chr 20:3-29 | 14:13 | Exod 14:10, 14, 25 | - |
| 3.2.3 | 2 Chr 17:7-9* | 18:20 | - | - |
| 3.2.3 | 2 Chr 19:10 | 18:20 | - | - |
| 3.2.13 | 2 Chr 32:21 | 23:20-23 | - | - |
| 3.2.8b | 2 Chr 26:19-20 | 28:36-38 | - | - |
| 3.2.8a | 1 Chr 6:34(49)* | 30:7-8 | Exod 40:26-27 | Num 17:5(16:40) |
| 3.2.8a | 2 Chr 2:2-3(3-4)* | 30:7-8 | Exod 40:26-27 | Num 17:5(16:40) |
| 3.2.8a | 2 Chr 13:11* | 30:7-8 | Exod 40:26-27 | Num 17:5(16:40) |
| 3.2.8a | 2 Chr 26:16-21 | 30:7-8 | Exod 40:26-27 | Num 17:5(16:40) |
| 3.2.8a | 2 Chr 29:7* | 30:7-8 | Exod 40:26-27 | Num 17:5(16:40) |
| 3.2.7 | 1 Chr 29:7* | 30:11-16 | - | - |
| 3.2.7 | 2 Chr 24:6-12 | 30:11-16 | - | - |
| 3.2.7 | 2 Chr 34:8-14* | 30:11-16 | - | - |
| 3.2.2 | 1 Chr 9:30* | 30:25 | - | - |
| 3.2.2 | 2 Chr 16:14 | 30:25 | - | - |
| 3.2.9 | 2 Chr 27:2 | 32:7 | - | Deut 9:12 |
| 3.2.12 | 2 Chr 29:10* | 32:8-13 | - | Neh 9:16-19, 26-32 |
| 3.2.12 | 2 Chr 30:6-9 | 32:8-13 | - | Neh 9:16-19, 26-32 |
| 3.2.12 | 2 Chr 36:13* | 32:8-13 | - | Neh 9:16-19, 26-32 |
| 3.2.14 | 2 Chr 15:16* | 32:20 | - | Deut 9:21 |
| 3.2.14 | 2 Chr 34:4-7 | 32:20 | - | Deut 9:21 |
| 3.2.10 | 2 Chr 28:19 | 32:25 | - | - |
| 3.2.11 | 2 Chr 29:31 | 35:5, 22 | - | - |

[1] The texts marked with an asterisk (*) are examined in the study as a recurrence.

[2] Exod 1:11-13; 2:23; 5:9, 11, 18; 6:5-6; 7:4, 13, 16, 22; 8:11(15), 15(19); 9:12; 11:9.

[3] Exod 7:27(8:2); 12:13, 23, 27.

# Appendix C: Lexical Markers, Ordered by Section

| Section | 2 Chr Text | Recurrence(s) | Primary Evoked Text(s) | Secondary Evoked Text(s) | Lexical Markers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3.2.1 | 10:4-16 | 2 Chr 25:16-20; 35:22 | Exod 1:14; 6:9 | Various[1] | מַס, לֹא שׁמע, כבד, עֲבֹדָה קָשָׁה |
| 3.2.2 | 16:14 | 1 Chr 9:30 | Exod 30:25 | - | מַעֲשֶׂה, רֹקַח/רקח, מִרְקַחַת |
| 3.2.3 | 19:10 | 2 Chr 17:7-9 | Exod 18:20 | - | שַׂר, זהר + חֹק + תּוֹרָה |
| 3.2.4 | 20:3-29 | - | Exod 14:13 | Exod 14:10, 14, 25 | לחם יְהוָה, (לֹא) לחם לָכֶם, אַל ירא, ירא, יצב + וּרְאוּ אֶת־יְשׁוּעַת יְהוָה עִמָּכֶם |
| 3.2.5 | 21:14 | 1 Chr 21:17 | Exod 9:14 | Various[2] | מַגֵּפָה + בְּעַמֶּךָ |
| 3.2.6 | 22:11 | - | Exod 2:7 | Exod 2:4-5, 8-10 | אָחוֹת, בַּת, לקח, מֵינֶקֶת |
| 3.2.7 | 24:6-12 | 1 Chr 29:7;<br>2 Chr 34:8-14 | Exod 30:11-16 | - | נתן + כֶּסֶף + עֲבֹדָה |
| 3.2.8a | 26:16-21 | 1 Chr 6:34(49);<br>2 Chr 2:2-3(3-4); 13:11; 29:7 | Exod 30:7-8;<br>Num 17:5(16:40) | Exod 40:26-27 | אַהֲרֹן, מִזְבַּח, קטר + קְטֹרֶת |
| 3.2.8b | 26:19-20 | - | Exod 28:36-38 | - | מֵצַח |
| 3.2.9 | 27:2 | - | Exod 32:7; Deut 9:12 | - | שׁחת + עַם |
| 3.2.10 | 28:19 | - | Exod 32:25 | - | פרע |
| 3.2.11 | 29:31 | - | Exod 35:5, 22 | - | בוא, כֹּל נָדִיב לֵב |

[1] Exod 1:11, 13; 2:23; 5:9, 11, 18; 6:5-6; 7:4, 13, 16, 22; 8:11(15), 15(19); 9:12; 11:9.

[2] Exod 7:27(8:2); 12:13, 23, 27.

| Section | 2 Chr Text | Recurrence(s) | Primary Evoked Text(s) | Secondary Evoked Text(s) | Lexical Markers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3.2.12 | 30:6-9 | 2 Chr 29:10; 36:13 | Exod 32:8-13;<br>Neh 9:16-19, 26-32 | - | סור, עֹרֶף קשׁה, שׁוב<br>אַבְרָהָם יִצְחָק וְיִשְׂרָאֵל, אַף חָרוֹן [3]<br>מַלְכֵי אַשּׁוּר, רַחֲמִים, חַנּוּן וְרַחוּם, אָב [4] |
| 3.2.13 | 32:21 | - | Exod 23:20-23 | - | שׁלח + מַלְאָךְ, כחד |
| 3.2.14 | 34:4-7 | 2 Chr 15:16 | Exod 32:20; Deut 9:21 | - | כתת, וַיִּזְרֹק עַל־פְּנֵי, דקק, שׂרף |
| 3.2.15 | 35:13 | - | Exod 12:9-11; Deut 16:7 | - | בשׁל, פֶּסַח |

[3] The lexical markers on this line are exclusively between 2 Chr 30:6-9 and Exod 32:8-13.

[4] The lexical markers on this line are exclusively between 2 Chr 30:6-9 and Neh 9:16-19, 26-32.

# Appendix D: Uses of Allusions (including Recurrences), Ordered by Location in Chronicles

| Section | Alluding Text[1] | Exodus Primary Evoked Text | Exodus Secondary Evoked Text | Co-Evoked Text | Use(s) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3.2.8a | 1 Chr 6:34(49)* | 30:7-8 | Exod 40:26-27 | Num 17:5(16:40) | Establish standard, elevate priesthood |
| 3.2.2 | 1 Chr 9:30* | 30:25 | - | - | Establish standard, elevate priesthood |
| 3.2.5 | 1 Chr 21:17* | 9:14 | Various[2] | - | Establish truth, positive moral evaluation |
| 3.2.7 | 1 Chr 29:7* | 30:11-16 | - | - | Establish standard, elevate temple |
| 3.2.8a | 2 Chr 2:2-3(3-4)* | 30:7-8 | Exod 40:26-27 | Num 17:5(16:40) | Reaffirm standard, elevate temple and priesthood |
| 3.2.1 | 2 Chr 10:4-16 | 1:14; 6:9 | Various[3] | - | Negative moral evaluation |
| 3.2.8a | 2 Chr 13:11* | 30:7-8 | Exod 40:26-27 | Num 17:5(16:40) | Negative moral evaluation, positive moral evaluation, reaffirm standard, elevate priesthood |
| 3.2.14 | 2 Chr 15:16* | 32:20 | - | Deut 9:21 | Positive moral evaluation |
| 3.2.2 | 2 Chr 16:14 | 30:25 | - | - | Negative moral evaluation |
| 3.2.3 | 2 Chr 17:7-9* | 18:20 | - | - | Positive moral evaluation |

[1] The texts marked with an asterisk (*) are examined in the study as a recurrence.

[2] Exod 7:27(8:2); 12:13, 23, 27.

[3] Exod 1:11-13; 2:23; 5:9, 11, 18; 6:5-6; 7:4, 13, 16, 22; 8:11(15), 15(19); 9:12; 11:9.

| Section | Alluding Text[1] | Exodus Primary Evoked Text | Exodus Secondary Evoked Text | Co-Evoked Text | Use(s) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3.2.3 | 2 Chr 19:10 | 18:20 | - | - | Positive moral evaluation, exegesis – combine texts |
| 3.2.4 | 2 Chr 20:3-29 | 14:13 | Exod 14:10, 14, 25 | - | Encouragement |
| 3.2.5 | 2 Chr 21:14 | 9:14 | Various[2] | - | Negative moral evaluation, reaffirm truth |
| 3.2.6 | 2 Chr 22:11 | 2:7 | Exod 2:4-5, 8-10 | - | Positive moral evaluation (Jehoshabeath), positive moral evaluation (Joash), negative moral evaluation |
| 3.2.7 | 2 Chr 24:6-12 | 30:11-16 | - | - | Positive moral evaluation, elevate temple |
| 3.2.1 | 2 Chr 25:16-20* | - | Various[3] | - | Negative moral evaluation |
| 3.2.8a | 2 Chr 26:16-21 | 30:7-8 | Exod 40:26-27 | Num 17:5(16:40) | Negative moral evaluation, elevate temple and priesthood |
| 3.2.8b | 2 Chr 26:19-20 | 28:36-38 | - | - | Negative moral evaluation, elevate priesthood |
| 3.2.9 | 2 Chr 27:2 | 32:7 | - | Deut 9:12 | Negative moral evaluation, positive moral evaluation, establish truth |
| 3.2.10 | 2 Chr 28:19 | 32:25 | - | - | Negative moral evaluation |
| 3.2.8a | 2 Chr 29:7* | 30:7-8 | Exod 40:26-27 | Num 17:5(16:40) | Negative moral evaluation, positive moral evaluation, elevate temple and priesthood |

[1] The texts marked with an asterisk (*) are examined in the study as a recurrence.

[2] Exod 7:27(8:2); 12:13, 23, 27.

[3] Exod 1:11-13; 2:23; 5:9, 11, 18; 6:5-6; 7:4, 13, 16, 22; 8:11(15), 15(19); 9:12; 11:9.

| Section | Alluding Text[1] | Exodus Primary Evoked Text | Exodus Secondary Evoked Text | Co-Evoked Text | Use(s) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3.2.12 | 2 Chr 29:10* | 32:8-13 | - | Neh 9:16-19, 26-32 | Positive moral evaluation |
| 3.2.11 | 2 Chr 29:31 | 35:5, 22 | - | - | Positive moral evaluation, elevate temple |
| 3.2.12 | 2 Chr 30:6-9 | 32:8-13 | - | Neh 9:16-19, 26-32 | Negative moral evaluation, encouragement |
| 3.2.13 | 2 Chr 32:21 | 23:20-23 | - | - | Exegesis – fulfillment, positive moral evaluation |
| 3.2.14 | 2 Chr 34:4-7 | 32:20 | - | Deut 9:21 | Positive moral evaluation |
| 3.2.7 | 2 Chr 34:8-14* | 30:11-16 | - | - | Reaffirm truth, elevate temple |
| 3.2.15 | 2 Chr 35:13 | 12:9-11 | - | Deut 16:7 | Positive moral evaluation, exegesis – combine texts |
| 3.2.1 | 2 Chr 35:22* | - | Various[3] | - | Negative moral evaluation |
| 3.2.12 | 2 Chr 36:13* | 32:8-13 | - | Neh 9:16-19, 26-32 | Negative moral evaluation |

[1] The texts marked with an asterisk (*) are examined in the study as a recurrence.

[3] Exod 1:11-13; 2:23; 5:9, 11, 18; 6:5-6; 7:4, 13, 16, 22; 8:11(15), 15(19); 9:12; 11:9.

# Appendix E:

# Connections between Deut 17; 1 Kgs 10; 2 Chr 1; and 2 Chr 9

The below highlights the relevant added or altered material and significant lexical connections between the four passages.[1]

| Deuteronomy 17:16-17 |
| --- |
| 16 רַק לֹא־יַרְבֶּה־לּוֹ סוּסִים וְלֹא־יָשִׁיב אֶת־הָעָם מִצְרַיְמָה לְמַעַן הַרְבּוֹת סוּס וַיהוָה אָמַר לָכֶם לֹא תֹסִפוּן לָשׁוּב בַּדֶּרֶךְ הַזֶּה עוֹד: 17 וְלֹא יַרְבֶּה־לּוֹ נָשִׁים וְלֹא יָסוּר לְבָבוֹ וְכֶסֶף וְזָהָב לֹא יַרְבֶּה־לּוֹ מְאֹד: |
| 1 Kings 10:25, 27-29 |
| 25 וְהֵמָּה מְבִאִים אִישׁ מִנְחָתוֹ כְּלֵי כֶסֶף וּכְלֵי זָהָב וּשְׂלָמוֹת וְנֶשֶׁק וּבְשָׂמִים סוּסִים וּפְרָדִים דְּבַר־ שָׁנָה בְּשָׁנָה: 27 וַיִּתֵּן הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶת־הַכֶּסֶף בִּירוּשָׁלַם כָּאֲבָנִים וְאֶת הָאֲרָזִים נָתַן כַּשִּׁקְמִים אֲשֶׁר־ בַּשְּׁפֵלָה לָרֹב: 28 וּמוֹצָא הַסּוּסִים אֲשֶׁר לִשְׁלֹמֹה מִמִּצְרָיִם וּמִקְוֵה סֹחֲרֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ יִקְחוּ מִקְוֶה בְּמְחִיר: 29 וַתַּעֲלֶה וַתֵּצֵא מֶרְכָּבָה מִמִּצְרַיִם בְּשֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת כֶּסֶף וְסוּס בַּחֲמִשִּׁים וּמֵאָה וְכֵן לְכָל־מַלְכֵי הַחִתִּים וּלְמַלְכֵי אֲרָם בְּיָדָם יֹצֵאוּ: |
| 2 Chronicles 1:15-17 |
| 15 וַיִּתֵּן הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶת־הַכֶּסֶף וְאֶת־הַזָּהָב בִּירוּשָׁלַם כָּאֲבָנִים וְאֶת הָאֲרָזִים נָתַן כַּשִּׁקְמִים אֲשֶׁר־בַּשְּׁפֵלָה לָרֹב: 16 וּמוֹצָא הַסּוּסִים אֲשֶׁר לִשְׁלֹמֹה מִמִּצְרָיִם וּמִקְוֵא סֹחֲרֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ מִקְוֵא יִקְחוּ בִּמְחִיר: 17 וַיַּעֲלוּ וַיּוֹצִיאוּ מִמִּצְרַיִם מֶרְכָּבָה בְּשֵׁשׁ מֵאוֹת כֶּסֶף וְסוּס בַּחֲמִשִּׁים וּמֵאָה וְכֵן לְכָל־מַלְכֵי הַחִתִּים וּמַלְכֵי אֲרָם בְּיָדָם יוֹצִיאוּ: |
| 2 Chronicles 9:24, 27-28 |
| 24 וְהֵם מְבִיאִים אִישׁ מִנְחָתוֹ כְּלֵי כֶסֶף וּכְלֵי זָהָב וּשְׂלָמוֹת נֶשֶׁק וּבְשָׂמִים סוּסִים וּפְרָדִים דְּבַר־שָׁנָה בְּשָׁנָה: 27 וַיִּתֵּן הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶת־הַכֶּסֶף בִּירוּשָׁלַם כָּאֲבָנִים וְאֶת הָאֲרָזִים נָתַן כַּשִּׁקְמִים אֲשֶׁר־בַּשְּׁפֵלָה לָרֹב: 28 וּמוֹצִיאִים סוּסִים מִמִּצְרַיִם לִשְׁלֹמֹה וּמִכָּל־הָאֲרָצוֹת: |

[1] The text is taken from the Codex Leningradensis Hebrew Text from Bibleworks 10.

# Appendix F: Kings of Judah in 2 Chr 10-36

| King and Text | Length of Reign | Introductory Evaluation | Major Event(s) during Reign | Additional Evaluation(s) | End of Life Summary | Burial |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rehoboam; 10:1-12:16 (58 verses) | 17 years (12:13) | Rehoboam listens to foolish counsel, resulting in dire consequences (10:1-18) | Northern and southern kingdoms split (10:19); Egypt attacks but does not destroy (12:1-12) | Others come to Judah/Jerusalem seeking YHWH, follow David/Solomon for 3 years (11:13-17); Rehoboam abandons the Torah, but he and leaders humble themselves when warned (12:1, 5-7); humbles himself, averts wrath of YHWH, Judah experiences good things, Rehoboam grows strong (12:12-13); "And he did what was wicked for he did not order his heart to seek YHWH" (12:14) | "And the matters of Rehoboam, the first and the last, are they not written… And there were wars between Rehoboam and Jeroboam all the days" (12:15) | "And he was buried in the city of David" (12:16) |
| Abijah; 13:1-23(14:1) (23 verses) | 3 years (13:2) | "And war there was between Abijah and Jeroboam" (13:2) | Abijah addresses Jeroboam and Israel (13:4-12); Judah defeats Israel (13:13-20) | "And the sons of Judah were strong because they relied on YHWH, the God of their fathers" (13:18); in contrast to Jeroboam, "Abijah strengthened himself" (13:20-21) | "And the rest of the matters of Abijah, and his ways and his words, are written…" (13:22) | "And they buried him in the city of David" (13:23[14:1]) |
| Asa; 13:23(14:1)-16:14 (48 verses) | 41 years (16:13) | "In his days, the land was at rest ten years. And Asa did what was right in the eyes of YHWH" (13:23b-14:1[14:1b-2]) | God defeats the Cushites (14:8-14[9-14]); repaired the altar of YHWH (15:8); covenant made with the people (15:9-15); Asa allies with Aram (16:1-10) | "And there were no wars with him in these years because YHWH had given rest to him" (14:5); "The high places did not turn aside from Israel, yet the heart of Asa was whole all his days" (15:17); Asa furious with Hanani the seer and oppresses people because of Hanani's rebuke against Asa (16:7-10) | "And behold, the matters of Asa, the first and the last, behold, they are written…" (16:11) | "And they buried him in his tombs that he cut for himself in the city of David. And they laid him on the resting place, which he filled with spices and assorted mixtures of ointment mixtures of work. And they burned for him a very great burning" (16:14) |

| King and Text | Length of Reign | Introductory Evaluation | Major Event(s) during Reign | Additional Evaluation(s) | End of Life Summary | Burial |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jehoshaphat; 17:1-21:1 (102 verses) | 25 years (20:31) | Strengthens himself against Israel, fortifies Judah, YHWH is with him because he walks in the ways of David, he does not seek the Baals but seeks the God of his fathers, YHWH establishes his kingdom, his heart is high in the ways of YHWH, he removes the high places, he sends out teachers of the law, other kingdoms fear Judah and bring tribute, Judah's army is strong (17:1-19) | Marriage alliance with Ahab (18:1); warning from Micaiah (18:6-27); Israel and Judah fight Aram (18:28-19:1); Jehu's warning (19:2-3); Jehoshaphat sets up judicial system (19:5-11); God delivers Judah from enemies (20:1-30); Jehoshaphat allies with Israel again (20:35-37) | Jehu's positive and negative message (19:2-3); Jehoshaphat brings people back to YHWH (19:4); "And he walked in the way of his father Asa and did not turn aside from it, doing what was right in the eyes of YHWH. However, the high places did not turn aside; still, the people did not order their heart to the God of their fathers" (20:32-33) | "And the rest of the matters of Jehoshaphat, the first and the last, behold, they are written…" (20:34) | "And he was buried with his fathers in the city of David" (21:1) |
| Jehoram; 21:2-20 (19 verses) | 8 years (21:5, 20) | Jehoram kills his brothers and some of the princes of Israel (21:2-4); "And he walked in the way of the kings of Israel, just as the house of Ahab did, for the daughter of Ahab, his wife. And he did what was wicked in the eyes of YHWH" (21:6) | Revolts (21:9-10); letter from Elijah (21:12-15); defeat by Philistines and Arabians (21:16-17); bowel disease (21:18-19) | A revolt happens "because he abandoned YHWH, the God of his fathers" (21:10); "And YHWH stirred up against Jehoram the spirit of the Philistines and the Arabians…" (21:16); "And after all this, YHWH struck him in his bowels…" (21:18); "And his people did not make for him a burning like the burning of his fathers" (21:19) | - | "And he went without delight. And they buried him in the city of David, but not in the tombs of the kings" (21:20) |

| King and Text | Length of Reign | Introductory Evaluation | Major Event(s) during Reign | Additional Evaluation(s) | End of Life Summary | Burial |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ahaziah; 22:1-9 (9 verses) | 1 year (22:2) | "He also walked in the ways of the house of Ahab, for his mother was his counselor in doing wickedness. And he did what was wicked in the eyes of YHWH, like the house of Ahab, for they were to him counselors after the death of his father, to his destruction" (22:3-4) | Allies with Israel to fight Aram (22:5-8) | "And from God was the downfall of Ahaziah…" (22:7) | - | "And they buried him" (22:9) |
| Joash; 24:1-27 (27 verses) | 40 years (24:1) | "And Joash did what was right in the eyes of YHWH all the days of Jehoiada, the priest" (24:2) | Repairs the house of YHWH (24:4-14); Joash and princes abandon the house of YHWH and serve idols (24:17-18); they kill prophet Jehoiada's son (24:20-22); Aram defeats Judah (24:23-24) | "Though in small number the men of the army of Aram came, YHWH gave into their hand a very great army because they had abandoned YHWH, the God of their fathers. And they did judgments against Joash" (24:24) | "And his sons and the many oracles against him and the establishing of the house of God, behold they are written…" (24:27) | "And they buried him in the city of David, but they did not bury him in the tombs of the kings" (24:25) |
| Amaziah; 25:1-28 (28 verses) | 29 years (25:1) | "And he did what was right in the eyes of YHWH, except not with a whole heart" (25:2) | Kills servants who killed his father, but not those servants' children (25:3-4); defeats Edomites, worships Edom's gods; fights Israel and loses (25:5-22); captured by Israel (25:23) | "But Amaziah did not listen, for from God it was, in order that he might give them into a hand, for they sought the gods of Edom" (25:20) | "And the rest of the matters of Amaziah, the first and the last, behold, are they not written…" (25:26) | "And they buried him with his fathers in the city of David" (25:28) |

| King and Text | Length of Reign | Introductory Evaluation | Major Event(s) during Reign | Additional Evaluation(s) | End of Life Summary | Burial |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Uzziah; 26:1-23 (23 verses) | 52 years (26:3) | "And he did what was right in the eyes of YHWH according to all that Amaziah his father did" (26:4) | Successful war with Philistines (26:6-7); tries and fails to burn incense in the temple, given leprosy (26:16-20) | "And he was seeking God in the days of Zechariah… and in the days of his seeking YHWH, God prospered him" (26:5); "And according to his strength, his heart became proud, to his destruction. And he was unfaithful against YHWH his God…" (26:16) | Leper until death, cannot enter the house of YHWH, son reigns for him (26:21); "And the rest of the matters of Uzziah, the first and the last, Isaiah… wrote" (26:22) | "And they buried him with his fathers in the burial field that belonged to the kings, for they said, 'A leper is he'" (26:23) |
| Jotham; 27:1-9 (9 verses) | 16 years (27:1, 8) | "And he did what was right in the eyes of YHWH according to all that Uzziah his father did, except he did not go into the temple of YHWH" (27:2) | Defeats Ammonites (27:5) | "And Jotham strengthened himself because he ordered his ways before YHWH his God" (27:6) | "And the rest of the matters of Jotham, and all his wars and his ways, behold, they are written…" (27:7) | "And they buried him in the city of David" (27:9) |
| Ahaz; 28:1-27 (27 verses) | 16 years (28:1) | "And he did not do what was right in the eyes of YHWH as David, his father, but he walked in the ways of the kings of Israel…" (28:1-2) | Defeat by Aram and Israel (28:5-8); Solicits help from Assyria (28:16-21); worships gods of Damascus (28:23); closes temple (28:24) | "For YHWH humbled Judah because of King Ahaz of Israel for he caused a lack of restraint in Judah and was very unfaithful against YHWH" (28:19); "And he became more unfaithful against YHWH, this King Ahaz" (28:22); "But [the gods] were to him the cause of his fall and all Israel" (28:23); "And in every city of Judah he made high places to sacrifice to other gods, and he provoked to anger YHWH the God of his fathers" (28:25) | "And the rest of his matters and all his ways, the first and the last, behold, they are written…" (28:26) | "And they buried him in the city, in Jerusalem, for they did not bring him to the tombs of the kings of Israel" (28:27) |

| King and Text | Length of Reign | Introductory Evaluation | Major Event(s) during Reign | Additional Evaluation(s) | End of Life Summary | Burial |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hezekiah; 29:1-32:33 (117 verses) | 29 years (29:1) | "And he did what was right in the eyes of YHWH according to all that David his father did" (29:2) | Temple cleansing and worship restoration (29:3-36); Passover (30:1-27); God defeats Sennacherib of Assyria (32:1-23) | "And thus Hezekiah did in all Judah, and he did what was good, and right, and true before YHWH his God. And every work that he began in the service of the house of God by the law and commandment, seeking his God, with all his heart he did and prospered" (31:20-21); Hezekiah becomes proud, wrath comes (32:25) Hezekiah humbles himself, wrath is removed (26) | "And the rest of the matters of Hezekiah and his faithful acts, behold, they are written…" (32:32) | "And they buried him in the upper part of the tombs of the sons of David" (32:33) |
| Manasseh; 33:1-20 (20 verses) | 55 years (33:1) | "And he did what was wicked in the eyes of YHWH according to the abominations of the nations…" (33:2) | Assyria takes him to Babylon (33:11); then comes back to Jerusalem (33:13) | "And Manasseh caused to err Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem to do more wickedness than the nations…" (33:9); "he entreated the face of YHWH his God and humbled himself greatly before the face of the God of his fathers (33:12); Manasseh did wicked things in the eyes of YHWH, but also humbled himself (33:22-23) | "And the rest of the matters of Manasseh and his prayer to his God… behold, they are in… And his prayer, and how God was entreated by him, and all his sin and his unfaithfulness, and the places where he built high places on them, and he set up Asherim and the idols, before he humbled himself, behold, they are written…" (33:18-19) | "And they buried him in his house" (33:20) |
| Amon; 33:21-25 (5 verses) | 2 years (33:21) | "And he did what was wicked in the eyes of YHWH just as Manasseh his father did" (33:22) | - | "And to all the idols that Manasseh his father made Amon sacrificed and worshiped them… And he did not humble himself before YHWH… but this Amon multiplied his wrongdoing" (33:22-23) | - | - |

| King and Text | Length of Reign | Introductory Evaluation | Major Event(s) during Reign | Additional Evaluation(s) | End of Life Summary | Burial |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Josiah; 34:1-35:27 (60 verses) | 31 years (34:1) | "And he did what was right in the eyes of YHWH, and he walked in the ways of David, his father, and he did not turn to the right or left" (34:2) | Scroll of the Torah of YHWH is found (34:14); Huldah's prophecy (34:22-28); Covenant renewal (34:29-32); Passover (35:1-19); fights King of Egypt and dies (35:20-24) | "All his days [the people] did not turn from after YHWH God of their fathers" (34:33) | "And the rest of the matters of Josiah, and his faithful acts according to what is written in the law of YHWH, and his matters, the first and the last, behold, they are written… (35:26-27) | "And he was buried in the tombs of his fathers" (35:24) |
| Jehoahaz; 36:1-4 (4 verses) | 3 months (36:2) | - | King of Egypt deposes him (36:3); taken to Egypt (36:4) | - | - | - |
| Jehoiakim; 36:5-8 (4 verses) | 11 years (36:5) | "And he did what was wicked in the eyes of YHWH" (36:5) | Jehoiakim taken to Babylon (36:6) | - | "And the rest of the matters of Jehoiakim, his abominations that he did, and what was found against him, behold they are written…" (36:8) | - |
| Jehoiachin; 36:9-10 (2 verses) | 3 months, 10 days (36:9) | "And he did what was wicked in the eyes of YHWH" (36:9) | Jehoiachin taken to Babylon (36:10) | - | - | - |
| Zedekiah; 36:11-21 (11 verses) | 11 years (36:11) | "And he did what was wicked in the eyes of YHWH" (36:12) | Judah taken into exile in Babylon (36:17-21) | "He did not humble himself… And also against King Nebuchadnezzar he rebelled… And he stiffened his neck and hardened his heart" (36:12-13) | - | - |

# Reference List

Aberbach, M. & Smolar, L. 1967. Aaron, Jeroboam, and the Golden Calves. *Journal of Biblical Literature*. 86(2):129–140.

Albertz, R. 2011. Moses as Mediator of Divine Salvation: The Late Exilic Book of Exodus (Exod 1–34*), in G. Eidevall & B. Scheuer (eds.). *Enigmas and Images: Studies in Honor of Tryggve N. D. Mettinger*. (Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series no. 58). Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 53–72.

Albertz, R. 2015. Open-Mindedness for Understanding the Formation of the Pentateuch: The Challenge of Exodus 19-20, in M.C.A. Korpel & L.L. Grabbe (eds.). *Open-Mindedness in the Bible and Beyond: A Volume of Studies in Honour of Bob Becking*. (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies no. 616). London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark. 1–9.

Albertz, R. 2018. The Recent Discussion on the Formation of the Pentateuch/Hexateuch. *Hebrew Studies*. 59:65–92.

Alfaro, M.J.M. 1996. Intertextuality: Origins and Development of the Concept. *Atlantis*. 18(1/2):268–285.

Alkier, S. 2009. Intertextuality and the Semiotics of Biblical Texts, in R.B. Hays, S. Alkier, & L.A. Huizenga (eds.). *Reading the Bible Intertextually*. Waco: Baylor University Press. 3–21.

Alter, R. 1989. *The Pleasures of Reading in an Ideological Age*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Amar, I. 2017. The Characterization of Rehoboam and Jeroboam as a Reflection of the Chronicler's View of the Schism. *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures*. 17:1–30.

Amar, I. 2019. Form and Content in the Story of Asa in 2 Chr 13:23b-16:14: A Diachronic-Synchronic Reading. *Vetus Testamentum*. 69(3):337–360.

Amar, I. 2020. Expansion and Exile in the Chronicler's Narrative of the Two and a Half Tribes (1 Chr. 5.1-26). *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*. 44(3):357–376.

Amit, Y. 2001. *Reading Biblical Narratives: Literary Criticism and the Hebrew Bible*. Translated by Yael Lotan. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Amzallag, N. 2016. The Subversive Dimension of the Story of Jehoshaphat's War against the Nations (2 Chron. 20:1–30). *Biblical Interpretation*. 24(2):178–202.

Auld, A.G. 2000. What If the Chronicler Did Use the Deuteronomistic History? *Biblical Interpretation*. 8(1–2):137–150.

Awabdy, M.A. 2012. Yhwh Exegetes Torah: How Ezekiel 44:7—9 Bars Foreigners from the Sanctuary. *Journal of Biblical Literature*. 131(4):685–703.

Baden, J.S. 2017. Literary Allusions and Assumptions about Textual Familiarity, in Z. Zevit (ed.). *Subtle Citation, Allusion, and Translation in the Hebrew Bible*. Sheffield: Equinox Publishing Ltd. 114–130.

Balentine, S.E. 1997. "You Can't Pray a Lie": Truth *and* Fiction in the Prayers of Chronicles, in M.P. Graham, K.G. Hoglund, & S.L. McKenzie (eds.). *The Chronicler as Historian*. (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series no. 238). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 246–267.

Barker, J. 2018. From Where Does My Hope Come? Theodicy and the Character of YHWH in Allusions to Exodus 34:6-7 in the Book of the Twelve. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*. 61(4):697–715.

Barr, J. 1969. The Symbolism of Names in the Old Testament. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*. 52(1):11–29.

Barton, J. 2007. *The Nature of Biblical Criticism*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Barton, J. 2013. Déjà Lu: Intertextuality, Method or Theory? In K.J. Dell & W. Kynes (eds.). *Reading Job Intertextually*. (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies no. 574). New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark. 1–16.

Bautch, R. 2007. Intertextuality in the Persian Period, in J.L. Berquist (ed.). *Approaching Yehud: New Approaches to the Study of the Persian Period*. (Semeia Studies no. 50). Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature. 25–35.

Beentjes, P.C. 1982. Inverted Quotations in the Bible: A Neglected Stylistic Pattern. *Biblica*. 63:506–523.

Beentjes, P.C. 1993. Tradition and Transformation: Aspects of Innerbiblical Interpretation in 2 Chronicles 20. *Biblica*. 74(2):258–268.

Beentjes, P.C. 2015. King Asa and Hanani the Seer: 2 Chronicles 16 as an Example of the Chronicler's View of Prophets and Prophecy, in B.E.J.H. Becking & H. Barstad (eds.). *Prophecy and Prophets in Stories: Papers Read at the Fifth Meeting of the Edinburgh Prophecy Network, Utrecht, October 2013*. (Oudtestamentische Studien no. 65). Leiden: Brill. 141–151.

Ben Zvi, E. 2006. Revisiting "Boiling in Fire" in 2 Chronicles 35.13 and Related Passover Questions: Text, Exegetical Needs and Concerns, and General Implications, in I. Kalimi &

P.J. Haas (eds.). *Biblical Interpretation in Judaism and Christianity*. (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies no. 439). London: T & T Clark. 238–250.

Ben Zvi, E. 2011. One Size Does Not Fit All: Observations on the Different Ways that Chronicles Dealt with the Authoritative Literature of Its Time, in E. Ben Zvi & D.V. Edelman (eds.). *What Was Authoritative for Chronicles?*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 13–35.

Ben Zvi, E. 2013. Reading Chronicles and Reshaping the Memory of Manasseh, in P.S. Evans & T.F. Williams (eds.). *Chronicling the Chronicler: The Book of Chronicles and Early Second Temple Historiography*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 121–140.

Ben Zvi, E. 2014. *History, Literature and Theology in the Book of Chronicles*. New York: Routledge.

Ben-Porat, Z. 1976. The Poetics of Literary Allusion. *PTL: A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature*. 1:105–128.

Berger, Y. 2009a. Ruth and Inner-Biblical Allusion: The Case of 1 Samuel 25. *Journal of Biblical Literature*. 128(2):253–272.

Berger, Y. 2009b. Ruth and the David-Bathsheba Story: Allusions and Contrasts. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*. 33(4):433–452.

Berger, Y. 2010. Esther and Benjaminite Royalty: A Study in Inner-Biblical Allusion. *Journal of Biblical Literature*. 129(4):625–644.

Berger, Y. 2011. On Patterning in the Book of Samuel: 'News of Death' and the Kingship of David. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*. 35(4):463–481.

Berlin, A. 1983. *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative*. (Bible and Literature Series no. 9). Sheffield: Almond.

Berman, J. 2007. Ancient Hermeneutics and the Legal Structure of the Book of Ruth. *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*. 119(1):22–38.

Boda, M.J. & Floyd, M.H. Eds. 2003. *Bringing Out the Treasure: Inner Biblical Allusion in Zechariah 9-14*. (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series no. 370). London: T & T Clark International.

Boda, M.J. 2015. Reenvisioning the Relationship: Covenant in Chronicles, in R.J. Bautch & G.N. Knoppers (eds.). *Covenant in the Persian Period: From Genesis to Chronicles*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 391–407.

Boda, M.J. 2017. *Exploring Zechariah, Volume 2: The Development and Role of Biblical Traditions in Zechariah*. (Ancient Near East Monographs no. 17). Atlanta: SBL Press.

Bodner, K. 2013. Reading the Lists: Several Recent Studies of the Chronicler's Genealogies, in P.S. Evans & T.F. Williams (eds.). *Chronicling the Chronicler: The Book of Chronicles and Early Second Temple Historiography*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 29–41.

Bodner, K. 2015. *The Artistic Dimension: Literary Explorations of the Hebrew Bible*. (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies no. 590). London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

Branch, R.G. 2004. Athaliah, a Treacherous Queen: A Careful Analysis of Her Story in 2 Kings 11 and 2 Chronicles 22:10-23:21, in *die Skriflig*. 38(4):537–559.

Braun, R. 1986. *1 Chronicles*. (Word Biblical Commentary no. 14). Waco: Word Books.

Brettler, M.Z. 2017. Identifying Torah Sources in the Historical Psalms, in Z. Zevit (ed.). *Subtle Citation, Allusion, and Translation in the Hebrew Bible*. Sheffield: Equinox Publishing Ltd. 73–90.

Brown, F., Driver, S.R. & Briggs, C.A. [1907] 1977. *Enhanced Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers. [BDB]

Burns, J.B. 1987. Pharaoh in the Old Testament: A Literary Degradation. *Proceedings, Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Society*. 7:17–26.

Burns, J.B. 1991. Solomon's Egyptian Horses and Exotic Wives. *Foundations & Facets Forum*. 7(1–2):29–44.

Carr, D.M. 2001. Method in Determining Direction of Dependence: An Empirical Test of Criteria Applied to Exodus 34,11-26 and Its Parallels, in M. Köckert & E. Blum (eds.). *Gottes Volk am Sinai: Untersuchungen zu Ex 32-34 und Dtn 9-10*. (Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie no. 18). Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus. 505–535.

Carr, D.M. 2012. The Many Uses of Intertextuality in Biblical Studies: Actual and Potential, in M. Nissinen (ed.). *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010*. (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum no. 148). Leiden: Brill. 505–535.

Carr, D.M. 2017. Method in Determining the Dependence of Biblical on Non-Biblical Texts, in Z. Zevit (ed.). *Subtle Citation, Allusion, and Translation in the Hebrew Bible*. Sheffield: Equinox Publishing Ltd. 41–53.

Cherney, K.A. 2014. Allusion as Translation Problem: Portuguese Versions of Second Isaiah as Test Case. Dissertation. Stellenbosch University.

Childs, B.S. 1974. *The Book of Exodus*. (The Old Testament Library). Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Childs, B.S. 1979. *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Choi, J.H. 2010. *Traditions at Odds: The Reception of the Pentateuch in Biblical and Second Temple Period Literature*. (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies no. 518). New York: T & T Clark.

Cogan, M. 2001. *1 Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. (The Anchor Bible no. 10). New York: Doubleday.

Conte, G.B. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*. Translated by Charles Segal. (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology no. 44). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Coombs, J.H. 1984. Allusion Defined and Explained. *Poetics*. 13(6):475–488.

Cranz, I. 2019. The Motif of Uzziah's צרעת in the Deuteronomistic History, Chronicles, and Beyond. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*. 44(2):233–249.

Crouch, C.L. 2014. *Israel and the Assyrians: Deuteronomy, the succession treaty of Esarhaddon, and the nature of subversion*. (Ancient Near East Monographs no. 8). Atlanta: SBL Press.

Cudworth, T.D. 2014. The Division of Israel's Kingdom in Chronicles: A Re-examination of the Usual Suspects. *Biblica*. 95(4):498–523.

De Vries, S.J. 1975. Temporal Terms as Structural Elements in the Holy-War Tradition. *Vetus Testamentum*. 25(1):80–105.

De Vries, S.J. 1985. *1 Kings*. (Word Biblical Commentary no. 12). Waco: Word Books.

De Vries, S.J. 1989. *1 and 2 Chronicles*. (The Forms of the Old Testament Literature no. 11). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

DiFransico, L. 2015. Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusion through Metaphor. *Vetus Testamentum*. 65(4):542–557.

DiFransico, L. 2017. "He Will Cast their Sins into the Depths of the Sea . . ." Exodus Allusions and the Personification of Sin in Micah 7:7-20. *Vetus Testamentum*. 67(2):187–203.

Dillard, R. 1980. The Reign of Asa (2 Chronicles 14-16): An Example of the Chronicler's Theological Method. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*. 23(3):207–218.

Dillard, R. 1986. *2 Chronicles*. (Word Biblical Commentary no. 15). Waco: Word Books.

Dozeman, T.B. 2009. *Exodus*. (Eerdmann's Critical Commentary). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Draisma, S. Ed. 1989. *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel*. Kampen: J.H. Kok.

Driver, S.R. 1902. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*. 3rd ed. (International Critical Commentary). Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Duke, R.K. 1999. A Rhetorical Approach to Appreciating the Books of Chronicles, in M.P. Graham & S.L. McKenzie (eds.). *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture*. (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series no. 263). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 100–135.

Duke, R.K. 2009. Recent Research in Chronicles. *Currents in Biblical Research*. 8(1):10–50.

Edenburg, C. 1998. How (Not) to Murder a king: Variations on a theme in 1 Sam 24; 26. *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*. 12(1):64–85.

Edenburg, C. 2010. Intertextuality, Literary Competence and the Question of Readership: Some Preliminary Observations. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*. 35(2):131–148.

Emanuel, D. 2013. The Diachronic Order of Psalms 134-136. *Hebrew Studies*. 54:79–92.

Eslinger, L. 1992. Inner-Biblical Exegesis and Inner-Biblical Allusion: The Question of Category. *Vetus Testamentum*. 42:47–58.

Estelle, B.D. 2018. *Echoes of Exodus: Tracing a Biblical Motif*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Evans, J.F. 2006. An Inner-Biblical Interpretation and Intertextual Reading of Ezekiel's Recognition Formulae with the Book of Exodus. Dissertation. Stellenbosch University.

Evans, P.S. 2010. The Function of the Chronicler's Temple Despoliation Notices in Light of Imperial Realities in Yehud. *Journal of Biblical Literature*. 129(1):31–47.

Evans, P.S. 2013a. Historia or Exegesis? Assessing the Chronicler's Hezekiah-Sennacherib Narrative, in P.S. Evans & Williams, Tyler F. (eds.). *Chronicling the Chronicler: The Book of Chronicles and Early Second Temple Historiography*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 103–120.

Evans, P.S. 2013b. Let the Crime Fit the Punishment: The Chronicler's Explication of David's "Sin" in 1 Chronicles 21, in P.S. Evans & T.F. Williams (eds.). *Chronicling the Chronicler: The Book of Chronicles and Early Second Temple Historiography*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 65–80.

Farisani, E. 2004. The Composition and Date of Ezra-Nehemiah. *Old Testament Essays*. 17(2):208–230.

Fishbane, M.A. 1985. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Fishbane, M.A. 1998. The Hebrew Bible and Exegetical Tradition, in J.C. De Moor (ed.). *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel*. Leiden: Brill. 15–30.

Floyd, M.H. 2003. Deutero-Zechariah and Types of Intertextuality, in M.J. Boda & M.H. Floyd (eds.). *Bringing Out the Treasure: Inner Biblical Allusion in Zechariah 9-14*. (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series no. 370). London: T & T Clark International. 225–244.

Garrett, D.A. 2014. *A Commentary on Exodus*. (Kregel Exegetical Library). Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications.

Gibson, J. 2016. *Covenant Continuity and Fidelity: A Study of Inner-Biblical Allusion and Exegesis in Malachi*. (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies no. 625). London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

Giffone, B. 2016. *"Sit At My Right Hand": The Chronicler's Portrait of the Tribe of Benjamin in the Social Context of Yehud*. (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies no. 628). New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

Goswell, G. 2017. Putting the Book of Chronicles in Its Place. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*. 60(2):283–299.

Goswell, G. 2020. The Macro-Structural Role of the Former Prophets and the Historical Books in Old Testament Canons. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*. 63(3):455–471.

Graham, M.P., Hoglund, K.G. & McKenzie, S.L. Eds. 1997. *The Chronicler as Historian*. (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series no. 238). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Grice, H.P. 1975. Logic and Conversation, in P. Cole & J.L. Morgan (eds.). *Speech acts*. (Syntax and Semantics no. 3). New York: Academic Press. 41–58.

Grohmann, M. 2009. Psalm 113 and the Song of Hannah (1 Samuel 2:1-10) : A Paradigm for Intertextual Reading? In R.B. Hays, S. Alkier, & L.A. Huizenga (eds.). *Reading the Bible Intertextually*. Waco: Baylor University Press. 119–135.

Grohmann, M. & Kim, H.C.P. 2019. Introduction, in M. Grohmann & H.C.P. Kim (eds.). *Second Wave Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible*. (Resources for Biblical Study no. 93). Atlanta: SBL Press. 1–20.

van Grol, H.W.M. 1998. Exegesis of the Exile - Exegesis of Scripture? In J.C. De Moor (ed.). *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel*. Leiden: Brill. 31–61.

Haber, H. 1999. The Power of Hebrew Names. *Jewish Bible Quarterly*. 27(2):130–132.

Hagan, H. 2019. Basic Plots in the Bible: A Literary Approach to Genre. *Biblical Theology Bulletin*. 49(4):198–213.

Handy, L.K. 1988. Speaking of Babies in the Temple. *Proceedings, Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Society*. 8:155–165.

Hays, C.B. 2008. Echoes of the Ancient Near East? Intertextuality and the Comparative Study of the Old Testament, in J.R. Wagner, C.K. Rowe, & A.K. Grieb (eds.). *The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays on Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard B. Hays*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 20–43.

Hays, J.D. 2003. Has the Narrator Come to Praise Solomon or to Bury Him? Narrative Subtlety in 1 Kings 1-11. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*. 28(2):149–174.

Hays, R.B. 1989. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hays, R.B. 2005. *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Heckl, R. 2016. *Neuanfang und Kontinuität in Jerusalem: Studien zu den hermeneutischen Strategien im Esra-Nehemia-Buch*. (Forschungen zum Alten Testament no. 104). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Heckl, R. 2018. The Composition of Ezra-Nehemiah as a Testimony for the Competition Between the Temples in Jerusalem and on Mt. Gerizim in the Early Years of the Seleucid Rule over Judah, in M. Kartveit & G.N. Knoppers (eds.). *The Bible, Qumran, and the Samaritans*. (Studia Samaritana no. 10). Berlin: De Gruyter. 115–132.

Hicks, J.M. 2001. *1 & 2 Chronicles*. (College Press NIV Commentary). Joplin: College Press Pub. Co.

Hobbs, T.R. 1985. *2 Kings*. (Word Biblical Commentary no. 13). Waco: Word Books.

Hobson, R. 2013. The Memory of Sennacherib in Persian Yehud, in D.V. Edelman & E. Ben Zvi (eds.). *Remembering Biblical Figures in the Late Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods: Social Memory and Imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 199–220.

Hollander, J. 1981. *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hong, K.P. 2013. Synchrony and Diachrony in Contemporary Biblical Interpretation. *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*. 75(3):521–539.

House, P.R. 1995. *1, 2 Kings*. (The New American Commentary no. 8). Nashville: Broadman & Holman.

Hutton, J. 2007. Isaiah 51:9-11 and the Rhetorical Appropriation and Subversion of Hostile Theologies. *Journal of Biblical Literature*. 126(2):271–303.

Janzen, D. 2018. *Chronicles and the Politics of Davidic Restoration: A Quiet Revolution*. (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies no. 655). London: T & T Clark.

Japhet, S. 1979. Conquest and Settlement in Chronicles. *Journal of Biblical Literature*. 98(2):205–218.

Japhet, S. 1993. *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary*. (The Old Testament Library). Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Japhet, S. 1997. *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought*. Translated by Anna Barber. 2., rev. ed. ed. (Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentums no. 9). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Jeon, J. 2017. The Visit of Jethro (Exodus 18): Its Composition and Levitical Reworking. *Journal of Biblical Literature*. 136(2):289–306.

Jeon, J. 2018. The Priestly Tent of Meeting in Chronicles: Pro-Priestly or Anti-Priestly? *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures*. 18(7):1–15.

Jiang, S. 2019. God's Law and Theocracy: The Use of »YHWH's Torah« in Chronicles. *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*. 131(3):444–458.

Johnstone, W. 1997a. *1 and 2 Chronicles: Volume 1, 1 Chronicles 1-2 Chronicles 9, Israel's Place among the Nations*. Vol. 1. (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series no. 253). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Johnstone, W. 1997b. *1 and 2 Chronicles: Volume 2, 2 Chronicles 10-36, Guilt and Atonement*. Vol. 2. (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series no. 254). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Johnstone, W. 1998. *Chronicles and Exodus: An Analogy and its Application*. (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series no. 275). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Jonker, L.C. 2003. *Reflections of King Josiah in Chronicles: Late Stages of the Josiah Reception in II Chr. 34f.* (Textpragmatische Studien zur Hebräischen Bibel 2 no. 2). Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus.

Jonker, L.C. 2006. The Cushites in the Chronicler's Version of Asa's Reign: A Secondary Audience in Chronicles? *Old Testament Essays*. 19(3):863–881.

Jonker, L.C. 2007a. Reforming History: The Hermeneutical Significance of the Books of Chronicles. *Vetus Testamentum*. 57(1):21–44.

Jonker, L.C. 2007b. The Exile as Sabbath Rest: The Chronicler's Interpretation of the Exile. *Old Testament Essays*. 20(3):703–719.

Jonker, L.C. 2008a. The Chronicler and the Prophets. Who Were His Authoritative Sources? *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*. 22(2):275–295.

Jonker, L.C. 2008b. The Chronicler's Portrayal of Solomon as the King of Peace within the Context of the International Peace Discourses of the Persian Era. *Old Testament Essays*. 21(3):653–669.

Jonker, L.C. 2010a. David's Officials According to the Chronicler (1 Chronicles 23-27): A Reflection of Second Temple Self-Categorization? In L.C. Jonker (ed.). *Historiography and Identity (Re)formulation in Second Temple Historiographical Literature*. (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies no. 534). London: T & T Clark. 65–91.

Jonker, L.C. 2010b. Revisiting the Saul Narrative in Chronicles: Interacting with the Persian Imperial Context? *Old Testament Essays*. 23(3):283–305.

Jonker, L.C. 2011a. "Lewend en kragtig"? Die hermeneutiese dinamika en implikasies van (her)interpretasie in die Ou Testament. *Stellenbosch Theological Journal (formerly NGTT)*. 52(1):128–147.

Jonker, L.C. 2011b. A Review of James T. Sparks, The Chronicler's Genealogies: Towards an Understanding of 1 Chronicles 1-9. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*. 73(2):367–369.

Jonker, L.C. 2012a. Reading the Pentateuch's Genealogies after the Exile: The Chronicler's Usage of Genesis 1-11 in Negotiating an All-Israelite Identity. *Old Testament Essays*. 25(2):316–333.

Jonker, L.C. 2012b. What Do the "Good" and the "Bad" Kings Have in Common? Genre and Terminological Patterns in the Chronicler's Royal Narratives. *Journal for Semitics*. 21(2):340–373.

Jonker, L.C. 2013a. *1 & 2 Chronicles*. (Understanding the Bible Commentary Series). Grand Rapids: Baker Books.

Jonker, L.C. 2013b. Introduction. *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel (HeBAI)*. 2(3):275–286.

Jonker, L.C. 2013c. Why History Matters: The Place of Historical Consciousness in a Multidimensional Approach Towards Biblical Interpretation. *Verbum et Ecclesia*. 34(2):1–7.

Jonker, L.C. 2014. Within Hearing Distance? Recent Developments in Pentateuch and Chronicles Research. *Old Testament Essays*. 27(1):123–146.

Jonker, L.C. 2015. "The Ark of the Covenant of the Lord": The Place of Covenant in the Chronicler's Theology, in R. Bautch & G. Knoppers (eds.). *Covenant in the Persian Period: From Genesis to Chronicles*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 393–414.

Jonker, L.C. 2016. *Defining All-Israel in Chronicles: Multi-levelled Identity Negotiation in Late Persian-Period Yehud*. (Forschungen zum Alten Testament no. 106). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Jonker, L.C. 2017. What Was Considered to Be Apostasy by the Chronicler, and How Does It Relate to Deuteronomic Law? *Journal for Semitics*. 26(1):382–411.

Jonker, L.C. 2020. Holiness and the Levites: Some reflections on the Relationship between Chronicles and Pentateuchal Traditions, in J.J. Krause, W. Oswald, & K. Weingart (eds.). *Eigensinn und Entstehung der Hebräischen Bibel: Erhard Blum zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. 457–474.

Juvan, M. 2008a. *History and Poetics of Intertextuality*. Translated by Timothy Pogačar. (Comparative Cultural Studies). West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.

Juvan, M. 2008b. Towards a History of Intertextuality in Literary and Culture Studies. *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture*. 10(3):1–9.

Kalimi, I. 1997. Was the Chronicler a Historian? In M.P. Graham, K.G. Hoglund, & S.L. McKenzie (eds.). *The Chronicler as Historian*. (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series no. 238). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 73–89.

Kalimi, I. 2002a. The Capture of Jerusalem in the Chronistic History. *Vetus Testamentum*. 52(1):66–79.

Kalimi, I. 2002b. The View of Jerusalem in the Ethnographical Introduction of Chronicles (1 Chr 1-9). *Biblica*. 83(4):556–562.

Kalimi, I. 2004. The Date of the Book of Chronicles, in D.L. Ellens, I. Kalimi, R. Knierim, & J.H. Ellens (eds.). *God's Word for Our World, Vol. 1*. Vol. 1. (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies no. 388). New York: T & T Clark International. 347–371.

Kalimi, I. 2005a. *An Ancient Israelite Historian: Studies in the Chronicler, His Time, Place and Writing*. (Studia Semitica Neerlandica no. 46). Assen: Royal Van Gorcum.

Kalimi, I. 2005b. *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Kalimi, I. 2009. Placing the Chronicler in His Own Historical Context: A Closer Examination. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*. 68(3):179–192.

Kawashima, R.S. 2007. Comparative Literature and Biblical Studies: The Case of Allusion. *Prooftexts*. 27(2):324–344.

Kelly, J.R. 2014. Intertextuality and Allusion in the Study of the Hebrew Bible. Dissertation. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Kelly, J.R. 2017. Identifying Literary Allusions: Theory and the Criterion of Shared Language, in Z. Zevit (ed.). *Subtle Citation, Allusion, and Translation in the Hebrew Bible*. Sheffield: Equinox Publishing Ltd. 22–40.

Kislev, I. 2020. The Role of the Altar in the Book of Chronicles. *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures*. 20(3):1–16.

Klein, N. 2015. Between Genealogy and Historiography: Er, Achar and Saul in the Book of Chronicles. *Vetus Testamentum*. 65:1–28.

Klein, R.W. 2006. *1 Chronicles: A Commentary*. (Hermeneia). Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Klein, R.W. 2012. *2 Chronicles: A Commentary*. (Hermeneia). Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Kleinig, J.W. 1994. Recent Research in Chronicles. *Currents in Research*. 2:43–76.

Kline, J.G. 2016. *Allusive Soundplay in the Hebrew Bible*. (Ancient Israel and Its Literature no. 28). Atlanta: SBL Press.

Knoppers, G.N. 1990. Rehoboam in Chronicles: Villain or Victim? *Journal of Biblical Literature*. 109(3):423–440.

Knoppers, G.N. 1994. Jehoshaphat's Judiciary and "The Scroll of Yhwh's Torah". *Journal of Biblical Literature*. 113(1):59–80.

Knoppers, G.N. 1995. Images of David in Early Judaism: David as Repentant Sinner in Chronicles. *Biblica*. 76(4):449–470.

Knoppers, G.N. 1999. Jerusalem at War in Chronicles, in R.S. Hess & G.J. Wenham (eds.). *Zion, City of Our God*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 57–76.

Knoppers, G.N. 2004a. *I Chronicles*. Vol. 1. (The Anchor Bible no. 12). New York: Doubleday.

Knoppers, G.N. 2004b. *I Chronicles*. Vol. 2. (The Anchor Bible no. 12A). New York: Doubleday.

Knoppers, G.N. 2012. The Relationship of the Deuteronomistic History to Chronicles: Was the Chronicler a Deuteronomist? In M. Nissinen (ed.). *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010*. (Vetus Testamentum, Supplements no. 148). Leiden: Brill. 307–341.

Knoppers, G.N. 2015. Judah, Levi, David, Solomon, Jerusalem, and the Temple: Election and Covenant in Chronicles, in N. MacDonald (ed.). *Covenant and Election in Exilic and Post-Exilic Judaism*. (Forschungen zum Alten Testament no. 79). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. 139–168.

Knuteson, R.E. 2005. Elijah's Little-Known Letter in 2 Chronicles 21:12-15. *Bibliotheca Sacra*. 162:23–32.

Koehler, L., Baumgartner, W., Richardson, M.E.J. & Stamm, J.J. 2000. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Leiden: Brill. [*HALOT*]

Koorevaar, H.J. 2015. Chronicles as the Intended Conclusion to the Old Testament Canon, in J. Steinberg & T.J. Stone (eds.). *The Shape of the Writings*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 207–235.

Kristeva, J. 1969. *Σημειωτικη [Sēmeiōtikē]: Recherches pour une sémanalyse*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.

Kristeva, J. 1980. Word, Dialogue, and Novel, in L.S. Roudiez (ed.)Translated by Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, & Leon S. Roudiez. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. New York: Columbia University Press. 64–91.

Kronfeld, C. 1985. Allusion: An Israeli Perspective. *Prooftexts*. 5(2):137–163.

Kugel, J.L. 1987. The Bible's Earliest Interpreters. *Prooftexts*. 7(3):269–283.

Kwon, J.J. 2017. Shared Ideas in Job and Deutero-Isaiah. *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*. 129(1):32–46.

Kynes, W. 2012. *My Psalm Has Turned into Weeping: Job's Dialogue with the Psalms*. (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft no. 437). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Kynes, W. 2013a. Intertextuality: Method and Theory in Job and Psalm 119, in K.J. Dell & P.M. Joyce (eds.). *Biblical Interpretation and Method: Essays in Honor of John Barton*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 201–213.

Kynes, W. 2013b. Job and Isaiah 40-55: Intertextualities in Dialogue, in K.J. Dell & W. Kynes (eds.). *Reading Job Intertextually*. (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies no. 574). New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark. 94–105.

Kynes, W. 2020. Morality and mortality: The dialogical interpretation of Psalm 90 in the book of Job. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*. 44(4):624–641.

Lee, S.Y. 2015. *An Intertextual Analysis of Zechariah 9-10: The Earlier Restoration Expectations of Second Zechariah*. (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies no. 599). New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

Leonard, J.M. 2008. Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions: Psalm 78 as a Test Case. *Journal of Biblical Literature*. 127(2):241–265.

Leonard, J.M. 2016. Inner-Biblical Interpretation and Intertextuality, in D. Mangum & Estes, Douglas (eds.). *Literary Approaches to the Bible*. (Lexham Methods Series no. 4). Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press. 97–141.

Leonard, J.M. 2017. Identifying Subtle Allusions: The Promise of Narrative Tracking, in Z. Zevit (ed.). *Subtle Citation, Allusion, and Translation in the Hebrew Bible*. Sheffield: Equinox Publishing Ltd. 91–113.

Lester, G.B. 2009. Inner-Biblical Allusion. *Theological Librarianship*. 2(2):89–93.

Lester, G.B. 2013. Inner-Biblical Interpretation, in S.L. McKenzie (ed.). *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Biblical Interpretation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 444–453.

Lester, G.B. 2015. *Daniel Evokes Isaiah: Allusive Characterization of Foreign Rule in the Hebrew-Aramaic Book of Daniel*. (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies no. 606). London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

Leuchter, M. 2009. »The Prophets« and »The Levites« in Josiah's Covenant Ceremony. *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*. 121(1):31–47.

Levin, Y. 2003. Who Was the Chronicler's Audience? A Hint from His Genealogies. *Journal of Biblical Literature*. 122(2):229–245.

Levine, Z.I. 2018. A Purposeful Process of Paternal Punishment: Leviticus 26 as Read and Referenced in the Books of 1-2 Chronicles, Jubilees, the Words of the Luminaries, and the Damascus Document. Dissertation. New York University.

Levinson, B.M. 2014. “Better That You Should Not Vow Than That You Vow and Not Fulfill”: Qoheleth’s Use of Textual Allusion and the Transformation of Deuteronomy’s Law of Vows, in K.J. Dell & W. Kynes (eds.). *Reading Ecclesiastes Intertextually*. (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies no. 587). New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark. 28–41.

Loader, J.A. 2008. Intertextualität in geschichteten Texten des Alten Testaments, in O. Wischmeyer & S. Scholz (eds.). *Die Bibel als Text: Beiträge zu einer textbezogenen Bibelhermeneutik*. Tübingen: Francke. 99–119.

Lubeck, R. 2001. Swallowing Jonah: Strategies of Reading Biblical Narratives. Dissertation. University of South Africa.

Lyons, M.A. 2009. *From Law to Prophecy: Ezekiel’s Use of the Holiness Code*. (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies no. 507). New York: T & T Clark.

Machacek, G. 2001. The Full-Knowing Reader: Allusion and the Power of the Reader in the Western Literary Tradition. *Modern Language Quarterly*. 62(3):290–293.

Machacek, G. 2007. Allusion. *PMLA*. 122(2):522–536.

Manjavacas, E., Long, B. & Kestemont, M. 2019. On the Feasibility of Automated Detection of Allusive Text Reuse. *arXiv:1905.02973 [cs]* [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/1905.02973 [2019, June 05].

McKenzie, S.L. 1984. *The Chronicler’s Use of the Deuteronomistic History*. (Harvard Semitic Monographs no. 33). Atlanta: Scholars Press.

McKenzie, S.L. 2004. *1-2 Chronicles*. (Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries). Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Meek, R.L. 2014. Intertextuality, Inner-biblical Exegesis, and Inner-biblical Allusion: The Ethics of a Methodology. *Biblica*. 95(2):280–291.

Merrill, E.H. 2014. The Meaning and Significance of the Exodus Event, in M.R. Fox (ed.). *Reverberations of the Exodus in Scripture*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications. 1–17.

Miller, G.D. 2011. Intertextuality in Old Testament Research. *Currents in Biblical Research*. 9(3):283–309.

Miner, E. 1965. Allusion, in A. Preminger (ed.). *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 18.

Miner, E. 1994. Allusion, in T.V.F. Brogan (ed.). *The New Princeton Handbook of Poetic Terms*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 13–15.

Moore, S.D. & Sherwood, Y. 2011. *The Invention of the Biblical Scholar: A Critical Manifesto*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Moyise, S. 2002. Intertextuality and Biblical Studies: A Review. *Verbum et Ecclesia*. 23(2):418–431.

Moyise, S. 2009. Intertextuality and Historical Approaches to the Use of Scripture in the New Testament, in R.B. Hays, S. Alkier, & L.A. Huizenga (eds.). *Reading the Bible Intertextually*. Waco: Baylor University Press. 23–32.

Myers, J.M. 1965. *II Chronicles*. Vol. 13. (The Anchor Bible). Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Nielsen, K. 2000. Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible, in A. Lemaire & M. Sæbø (eds.). *Congress Volume Oslo 1998*. (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum no. 80). Leiden: Brill. 17–31.

Nihan, C. 2007. *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus*. (Forschungen zum Alten Testament no. 25). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Nihan, C. 2016. Cult Centralization and the Torah Traditions in Chronicles, in P. Dubovsky, D. Markl, & J.-P. Sonnet (eds.). *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Rise of the Torah*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. 253–288.

Noble, P.R. 2002. Esau, Tamar, and Joseph: Criteria for Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions. *Vetus Testamentum*. 52(2):219–252.

Noth, M. 1987. *The Chronicler's History*. Translated by H. G. M Williamson. (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series no. 50). Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Pakkala, J. 2004. *Ezra the Scribe: The Development of Ezra 7-10 and Nehemiah 8*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Pattemore, S. 2002. Relevance Theory, Intertextuality, and the Book of Revelation. *United Bible Societies Bulletin*. 194/195:43–60.

Pattemore, S. 2011. On the Relevance of Translation Theory. *Review & Expositor*. 108(2):263–277.

Pattemore, S. 2013a. *A Quick Guide to Relevance Theory* [Online]. Available: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VAwro8BPPbM [2019, July 05].

Pattemore, S. 2013b. *What Sort of Thing Is Relevance Theory?* [Online]. Available: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CunsxLCE9To [2019, July 05].

Perri, C. 1978. On Alluding. *Poetics*. 7(3):289–307.

Petersson, L. 2019. The Linguistic Profile of the Priestly Narrative of the Pentateuch, in M. Armgardt, B. Kilchör, & M. Zehnder (eds.). *Paradigm Change in Pentateuhal Research*. (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft no. 22). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag. 243–264.

Prinsloo, G. 2018. Inner-biblical Allusion in Habakkuk's משא (Hab 1:1-2:20) and Utterances Concerning Babylon in Isaiah 13-23 (Isa 13:1-14:23; 21:1-10). *Old Testament Essays*. 31(3):663–691.

Provan, I.W. 1995. *1 and 2 Kings*. Vol. 7. (New International Biblical Commentary). Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Pucci, J.M. 1998. *The Full-Knowing Reader: Allusion and the Power of the Reader in the Western Literary Tradition*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Pyeon, Y. 2003. *You Have Not Spoken What Is Right About Me: Intertextuality and the Book of Job*. (Studies in Biblical Literature no. 45). New York: Peter Lang.

von Rad, G. 1966. The Levitical Sermon in I and II Chronicles, in Translated by E.W. Trueman Dicken. *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd. 267–280.

Reed, J. & Kinsley, W. 2008. The Anatomy of Allusion. *PMLA*. 123(1):251–254.

Ristau, K.A. 2009. Reading and Rereading Josiah: The Chronicler's Representation of Josiah for the Postexilic Community, in G.N. Knoppers & K.A. Ristau (eds.). *Community Identity in Judean Historiography: Biblical and Comparative Perspectives*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 219–247.

Ristau, K.A. 2015. "In the House of Judah, My Father's House": The Character of Joab in the Book of Chronicles, in I.D. Wilson & D.V. Edelman (eds.). *History, Memory, Hebrew Scriptures: A Festschrift for Ehud Ben Zvi*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 133–150.

Römer, T. 2016. How to Date Pentateuchal Texts – Some Case Studies, in J.C. Gertz, B.M. Levinson, D. Rom-Shiloni, & K. Schmid (eds.). *The Formation of the Pentateuch: Bridging the Academic Cultures of Europe, Israel, and North America*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. 357–370.

Rudolph, W., Elliger, K., & Kittle, R. (eds.). 1997. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft. [*BHS*]

Sabo, P.J. 2013. Seeking Saul in Chronicles, in P.S. Evans & T.F. Williams (eds.). *Chronicling the Chronicler: The Book of Chronicles and Early Second Temple Historiography*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 43–63.

Scheetz, J.M. 2012. *The Concept of Canonical Intertextuality and the Book of Daniel*. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co.

Schmid, K. 2000. Innerbiblische Schriftauslegung. Aspekte der Forschungsgeschichte, in R.G. Kratz, T. Krüger, & K. Schmid (eds.). *Schriftauslegung in der Schrift. Festschrift für Odil Hannes Steck zu seinem 65. Geburtstag.* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft no. 300). Berlin: De Gruyter. 1–22.

Schmid, K. 2008. *Literaturgeschichte des Alten Testaments: Eine Einführung*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Schmid, K. 2012. Genesis in the Pentateuch, in C.A. Evans, J.N. Lohr, & D.L. Petersen (eds.). *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*. (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum no. 152). Leiden: Brill. 27–50.

Schmid, K. 2014. Exodus in the Pentateuch, in C.A. Evans, J.N. Lohr, & T.B. Dozeman (eds.). *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*. (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum no. 164). Leiden: Brill. 27–60.

Schmid, K. 2015. Distinguishing the World of the Exodus Narrative from the World of Its Narrators: The Question of the Priestly Exodus Account in Its Historical Setting, in T.E. Levy, T. Schneider, & W.H.C. Propp (eds.). *Israel's Exodus in Transdisciplinary Perspective: Text, Archaeology, Culture, and Geoscience*. (Quantitative Methods in the Humanities and Social Sciences). Heidelberg: Springer. 331–344.

Schniedewind, W.M. 1995. "Are We His People or Not?" Biblical Interpretation During Crisis. *Biblica*. 77:540–550.

Schniedewind, W.M. 1999. The Chronicler as an Interpreter of Scripture, in M.P. Graham & S.L. McKenzie (eds.). *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture*. (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series no. 263). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 158–180.

Schreiner, D.B. 2018. The Annihilation of the Egyptian and Neo-Assyrian Armies: A Proposal of Inner-biblical Typology and Some Literary Critical Implications. *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*. 130(4):529–544.

Schultz, R.L. 1999. *The Search for Quotation: Verbal Parallels in the Prophets*. (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series no. 180). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Schultz, R.L. 2013. Job and Ecclesiastes: Intertextuality and a Protesting Pair, in K.J. Dell & W. Kynes (eds.). *Reading Job Intertextually*. (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies no. 574). New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark. 190–203.

Schweitzer, S.J. 2003. The High Priest in Chronicles: An Anomaly in a Detailed Description of the Temple Cult. *Biblica*. 84(3):388–402.

Schweitzer, S.J. 2011. Judging a Book by Its Citations: Sources and Authority in Chronicles, in E. Ben Zvi & D.V. Edelman (eds.). *What Was Authoritative for Chronicles?*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 37–65.

Schweitzer, S.J. 2013. The Genealogies of 1 Chronicles 1-9: Purposes, Forms, and the Utopian Identity of Israel, in P.S. Evans & T.F. Williams (eds.). *Chronicling the Chronicler: The Book of Chronicles and Early Second Temple Historiography*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 9–27.

Shields, P.E. 2019. Chronicles as the Intended Conclusion to the Hebrew Scriptures. *Channels: Where Disciplines Meet*. 3(2):1–16.

Siedlecki, A. 1999. Foreigners, Warfare and Judahite Identity in Chronicles, in M.P. Graham & S.L. McKenzie (eds.). *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture*. (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series no. 263). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 229–266.

Slotki, I.W. 1994. *Chronicles*. Revised second edition ed. (Soncino Books of the Bible). New York: The Soncino Press.

Smelik, K. 1998. The Representation of King Ahaz in 2 Kings 16 and 2 Chronicles 28, in J.C. De Moor (ed.). *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel*. Leiden: Brill. 143–185.

Snyman, G.F. 2011. Why Asa Was Not Deemed Good Enough: A Decolonial Reading of 2 Chronicles 14-16, in L.C. Jonker (ed.). *Texts, Contexts and Readings in Postexilic Literature: Explorations into Historiography and Identity Negotiation in Hebrew Bible and Related Texts*. (Forschungen zum Alten Testament no. 53). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. 241–268.

Sommer, B.D. 1996a. Allusions and Illusions: The Unity of the Book of Isaiah in Light of Deutero-Isaiah's Use of Prophetic Tradition, in R.F. Melugin & M.A. Sweeney (eds.). *New Visions of Isaiah*. (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series no. 214). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 156–186.

Sommer, B.D. 1996b. Exegesis, Allusion and Intertextuality in the Hebrew Bible: A Response to Lyle Eslinger. *Vetus Testamentum*. 46:479–489.

Sommer, B.D. 1998. *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40-66*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Sparks, J.T. 2008. *The Chronicler's Genealogies: Towards an Understanding of 1 Chronicles 1-9*. (Academia Biblica no. 28). Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Spawn, K.L. 2012. The Citation and Interpretation of the Law in Chronicles: The Chronicler's Distribution of Exegetical Devices in the Narratives of Solomon and Hezekiah, in I. Provan & M.J. Boda (eds.). *Let Us Go Up to Zion: Essays in Honour of H.G.M. Williamson on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum no. 153). Leiden: Brill. 317–328.

Stead, M.R. 2009. *The Intertextuality of Zechariah 1-8*. (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies no. 506). New York: T & T Clark.

Steiner, V.J. 1992. The Asa Narrative and the Chronicler's Exegetical Method: Intertextuality and the Question of Relevance in the Proclamation of Old Testament Narrative Texts. Dissertation. Trinity Evangelical Divinity School.

Strollo, M.F. 2017. The Value of the Relationship: An Intertextual Reading of Song of Songs and Lamentations. *Review & Expositor*. 114(2):190–202.

Stuart, D.K. 2006. *Exodus*. (The New American Commentary no. 2). Nashville: B&H Publishing Group.

Sweeney, M.A. 2007. *I & II Kings*. (The Old Testament Library). Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Sweeney, M.A. 2017. Isaiah 60-62 in Intertextual Perspective, in Z. Zevit (ed.). *Subtle Citation, Allusion, and Translation in the Hebrew Bible*. Sheffield: Equinox Publishing Ltd. 131–142.

Thompson, J.A. 1974. *Deuteronomy: An Introduction and Commentary*. (Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries no. 5). Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Thompson, J.A. 1994. *1, 2 Chronicles*. (The New American Commentary no. 9). Nashville: Broadman & Holman.

Tooman, W.A. 2011. *Gog of Magog: Reuse of Scripture and Compositional Technique in Ezekiel 38–39*. (Forschungen zum Alten Testament no. 52). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Tuell, S.S. 2001. *First and Second Chronicles*. (Interpretation). Louisville: John Knox Press.

Tull, P. 2000. Intertextuality and the Hebrew Scriptures. *Currents in Research*. 8:59–90.

Van Den Eynde, S. 2001. Chronicler's Usage of the Collocation ארון ברית יהוה. *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*. 113(3):422–430.

Van der Merwe, C.H.J., Naudé, J.A. & Kroeze, J. 2017. *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*. 2nd ed. New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

Van Wolde, E. 1989. Trendy Intertextuality? In S. Draisma (ed.). *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel*. Kampen: J.H. Kok. 43–49.

Vassar, J.S. 2007. *Recalling a Story Once Told: An Intertextual Reading of the Psalter and the Pentateuch*. Macon, GA: Mercer Univ. Press.

Wallace, H.N. 1999. What Chronicles Has to Say About Psalms, in M.P. Graham & S.L. McKenzie (eds.). *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture*. (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series no. 263). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 267–291.

Willi, T. 1972. *Die Chronik als Auslegung: Untersuchungen zur literarischen Gestaltung der historischen Überlieferung Israels*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Williamson, H.G.M. 1977. *Israel in the Books of Chronicles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williamson, H.G.M. 1985. *Ezra-Nehemiah, Volume 16*. (Word Biblical Commentary no. 16). Waco: Word Books.

Woods, E.J. 2011. *Deuteronomy: an introduction and commentary*. (Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries no. 5). Nottingham: InterVarsity Press.

Wright, J.L. 2007. A New Model for the Composition of Ezra-Nehemiah, in O. Lipschitz, G.N. Knoppers, & R. Albertz (eds.). *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.* Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 333–348.

Wright, J.W. 1997. The Fight for Peace: Narrative and History in the Battle Accounts in Chronicles, in M.P. Graham, K.G. Hoglund, & S.L. McKenzie (eds.). *The Chronicler as Historian*. (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series no. 238). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 150–177.

Wright, J.W. 1999. The Fabula of the Book of Chronicles, in M.P. Graham & S.L. McKenzie (eds.). *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture*. (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series no. 263). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 136–155.

Wright III, B.G. 2011. Solomon in Chronicles and Ben Sira: A Study in Contrasts, in J. Corley & H. van Grol (eds.). *Rewriting Biblical History: Essays on Chronicles and Ben Sira in Honour of Pancratius C. Beentjes*. Berlin: De Gruyter. 139–158.

Yamasaki, G. 2006. Point of View in a Gospel Story: What Difference Does It Make? Luke 19:1-10 as a Test Case. *Journal of Biblical Literature*. 125(1):89–105.

Yamasaki, G. 2016. Perspective Criticism: An Emerging Methodology for Analyzing Biblical Narrative. *Dialogismos*. 1:34–55.

Zevit, Z. 2017. Echoes of Texts Past, in Z. Zevit (ed.). *Subtle Citation, Allusion, and Translation in the Hebrew Bible*. Sheffield: Equinox Publishing Ltd. 1–21.

Zwickel, W. 1989. Über das angebliche Verbrennen von Räucherwerk bei der Bestattung eines Königs. *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*. 101(2):266–277.